

QUASIREGULAR MAPPINGS BETWEEN SUBRIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

CHANG-YU GUO, SEBASTIANO NICOLUSSI GOLO, AND MARSHALL WILLIAMS

ABSTRACT. The paper is devoted to establishing the foundations of the theory of quasiregular mappings $f : M \rightarrow N$ between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds of homogeneous dimension $Q \geq 2$. In particular, we generalize the notion of P -differentiability of Pansu [50] and Margulis-Mostow [40] to the setting of mappings between general subRiemannian manifolds and establish a corresponding Stepanov-type differentiability result. As a consequence, we show that a quasiregular mapping between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds of homogeneous dimension $Q \geq 2$ are P -differentiable a.e., satisfies Condition N and Condition N^{-1} , and the branch set has zero Hausdorff Q -measure. Our method does not rely on the results of Margulis-Mostow [40].

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces	6
2.1. Metric measure spaces	6
2.2. Modulus of a curve family	6
2.3. Sobolev spaces based on upper gradients	7
2.4. Spaces of locally bounded geometry	8
3. Geometry of equiregular subRiemannian manifolds	9
3.1. Ball-Box Theorem	10
4. Differentiability of Lipschitz mappings	11
4.1. Tangent cone	11
4.2. P -differentiability	12
4.3. A variant of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem	14
4.4. Blow-up of Lipschitz functions	16
4.5. Blow-up of horizontal vector fields	19
4.6. Stepanov's theorem	24
5. Quasiregular mappings	25
5.1. Definition of a quasiregular mapping	25
5.2. Analytic properties of quasiregular mappings	28

Date: November 18, 2015.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C17, 30C65, 58C06, 58C25.

Key words and phrases. subRiemannian manifolds, quasiregular mappings, Sobolev spaces, modulus of a curve family, P -differentiability, branch set, Poincaré inequality, locally bounded geometry.

C.Y.Guo was supported by the Magnus Ehrnrooth foundation and was partially supported by the Academy of Finland No. 131477.

5.3. Differentiability of quasiregular mappings	32
5.4. The minimal upper gradient and Jacobian	32
5.5. Equivalence of the two definitions of metric quasiregularity	35
5.6. Size of the branch set	36
6. Open questions	37
References	39

1. INTRODUCTION

Geometric function theory is largely concerned with generalisations to $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, of aspects of complex analysis, the theory of analytic functions and conformal mappings - particularly the geometric and function theoretic properties.

The category of mappings that one usually considers in this theory are the quasiregular mappings, or, if injective, quasiconformal mappings. Both kinds of mappings have the characteristic property of bounded distortion. The importance of quasiconformal mappings in complex analysis was realized by Ahlfors, Teichmüller and Morrey in the 1930s. Ahlfors used quasiconformal mappings in his geometric approach to Nevanlinna's value distribution theory that earned him one of the first two Fields medals. Teichmüller used quasiconformal mappings to measure a distance between two conformally inequivalent compact Riemann surfaces, starting what is now called Teichmüller theory. Morrey proved a powerful existence theorem, called the measurable Riemann mapping theorem, which has had tremendous impact on complex analysis and dynamics, Teichmüller theory, and low dimensional topology, inverse problems and conductivity.

The higher-dimensional theory of quasiconformal mappings was initiated in earnest by Reshetnyak, Gehring and Väisälä in the early 1960s [14, 15, 54]. The generalisations to non-injective mappings was initiated with Reshetnyak, and the basic theory was comprehensively laid and significantly advanced in a sequence of papers from the Finnish school of Martio, Rickman and Väisälä in the late 1960s [42, 43, 44].

For both the theory of quasiconformal mappings and quasiregular mappings in Euclidean spaces, there are three equivalent definitions, namely the metric definition, the analytic definition and the geometric definition. We begin with the metric definition, which describes the property that “infinitesimal balls are transformed to infinitesimal ellipsoids of bounded eccentricity”.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a domain. Let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a branched cover, i.e. f is continuous, discrete and open. For $x \in \Omega$, $0 < r < d(x, \partial\Omega)$, set

$$H_f(x, r) = \frac{L_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)},$$

where

$$L_f(x, r) = \sup \{ |f(x) - f(y)| : |x - y| \leq r \}$$

and

$$l_f(x, r) = \inf \{ |f(x) - f(y)| : |x - y| = r \}.$$

The mapping f is said to be metrically K -quasiregular if

$$H_f(x) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} H_f(x, r) < \infty$$

for all $x \in \Omega$ and $H_f(x) \leq K$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

The metric definition is easy to state, but not easy to use since the definition is a local, infinitesimal condition. The following analytic definition is more convenient to use. Recall that a continuous $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is analytically K -quasiregular, if $f \in W_{loc}^{1,n}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and if

$$|Df(x)|^n := \left(\sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^n: |h| \leq 1} |Df(x)h| \right)^n \leq K J_f(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

where $Df(x)$ is the differential matrix of f at x and $J_f(x)$ is the determinant of $Df(x)$.

Many early definitions for quasiconformality/quasiregularity used some modulus inequalities between curve families. A branched cover f is said to be geometrically K' -quasiregular if it satisfies the following K_O -inequality

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma) \leq K' \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} N(y, f, D) \rho^n(y) dy$$

for every open set $D \subset \Omega$, every curve family Γ in D and every admissible function ρ for $f(\Gamma)$; see Section 2 below for the definition of n -modulus.

Apparently, the metric definition is of infinitesimal flavor, the analytic definition is a point-wise condition, and the geometric definition is more of global feature. It is a deep fact that all the three definitions of quasiregularity are equivalent¹, quantitatively. The interplay of all three aspects of quasiconformality/quasiregularity is an important feature of the theory; see [5, 33, 54, 55, 60] for more on the Euclidean theory of these mappings.

The study of quasiconformal mappings beyond Riemannian spaces was first appeared in the celebrated work of Mostow [47] on strong rigidity of locally symmetric spaces. The boundary of rank-one symmetric spaces can be identified as certain Carnot groups of step two, and Mostow has developed the basic (metric) quasiconformal theory in these groups. Inspired by Mostow's work, Pansu [50] used the theory of quasiconformal mappings to study quasi-isometries of rank-one symmetric spaces. In particular, he has shown that the metric quasiconformal mappings are absolutely continuous on almost every lines. The systematic study of (metric) quasiconformal mappings on the Heisenberg group was later done by Korányi and Reimann [36, 37]. Margulis and Mostow [40] studies the absolute continuity of quasiconformal mappings along horizontal lines in the equiregular subRiemannian case and proved that quasiconformal mappings between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds are P -differentiable almost everywhere. By the break-through

¹Strictly speaking, for the quantitative equivalence of the three definitions of quasiregularity, we need to assume that our mapping f is a *sense-preserving* branched covering. Otherwise, according to the current formulation of the analytic definition, the Jacobian determinant of a (metric) quasiregular mapping f might be negative and so there might be a sign difference for the equivalence.

work of Heinonen and Koskela [27], a full-fledged (metric) quasiconformal theory exists in rather general metric measure spaces. This theory has subsequently been applied to new rigidity studies in geometric group theory, geometric topology and geometric paratrization of metric spaces; see for instance [7, 8, 30, 24, 53] and the references therein. This theory also initiated a new way of looking at weakly differentiable maps between non-smooth spaces. In [28], the Sobolev class of Banach space valued mappings was studied and several characterizations of quasiconformal mappings between metric spaces of locally bounded geometry were established. In particular, the equivalence of all the three definitions of quasiconformality was proved in their setting; see also [58, 59].

From then on, the study of quasiconformal/quasiregular mappings in non-smooth settings has received increasing interests. Heinonen and Rickman [30] studies the so-called mappings of bounded length distortion (BLD), which form a proper subclass of quasiregular mappings, between generalized manifolds of certain type. Onninen and Rajala [49] have developed a basic theory of quasiregular maps from Euclidean domains to generalized manifolds with restricted topology and locally controlled geometry; see also [1, 12, 18, 19, 61, 62, 63, 64] for the latest development of the theory in various non-smooth settings. In particular, Williams [64] proved the equivalence of all the three definitions of quasiregularity in the setting of metric spaces of locally bounded geometry. Let us point out that Riemannian manifolds and Carnot groups are typical examples of spaces of locally bounded geometry.

In this paper, we aim at developing the foundations of the theory of quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds. It should be noticed that subRiemannian manifolds serve as a natural class of singular spaces that lie between Riemannian manifolds and general metric measure spaces. In particular, the geometry of a subRiemannian manifold is meaningful: the tangent cone at each point admits a natural group structure that makes it into the so-called Carnot group and a well-known differential theory of mappings exists for mappings between such groups. So it is not a big surprise that the theory of quasiregular mappings can be developed from a differentiable point of view. On the other hand, there is no differential theory for mappings, other than quasiconformal mappings, at hand. Moreover, the differentiability theory developed by Margulis-Mostow [40] (for quasiconformal mappings) does not work for Lipschitz/quasiregular mappings. Indeed, this is a real obstacle and a different approach is necessary. We achieve this by proving a version of the Stepanov's theorem for mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds via a careful blow-up argument.

Theorem A. Let $f : (M, d) \rightarrow (\bar{M}, \bar{d})$ be a Borel function between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds. Then f is P -differentiable for a.e. o in the set

$$L(f) := \left\{ o \in M : \limsup_{p \rightarrow o} \frac{\bar{d}(f(o), f(p))}{d(o, p)} < \infty \right\}.$$

The definition of P -differential is given in Section 4 and it is a natural extension of the notion introduced by Pansu [50] and Margulis-Mostow [40]. It should be noticed that one cannot use the standard techniques as the Euclidean setting to prove Theorem A,

since it is not always possible to extend a Lipschitz mapping $f : A \rightarrow N$ from a closed subset A of M as a global Lipschitz mapping $\hat{f} : M \rightarrow N$.

On the other hand, even with such a nice differentiability theory at hand, one can not establish the whole theory as in the Euclidean setting [55]. We also take the advantage of the recent development of the theory of quasiregular mappings on metric measure spaces [28, 63, 64]. Indeed, our approach is based on both the differentiability theory and the metric point of view of quasiregular mappings.

Theorem B. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds of homogeneous dimension $Q \geq 2$. Then

- 1). f satisfies Condition N , i.e. $\text{Vol}_N(f(E)) = 0$ if $\text{Vol}_M(E) = 0$;
- 2). The area formula holds, namely, for all measurable function $h : N \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and every measurable set $A \subset M$,

$$(1.1) \quad \int_A h(f(x)) J_f(x) d\text{Vol}_M(x) = \int_N h(y) N(y, f, A) d\text{Vol}_N(y),$$

where $N(y, f, A) = \text{card}(f^{-1}(y) \cap A)$ is the multiplicity function of f on A .

- 3). f satisfies Condition N^{-1} , i.e. $\text{Vol}_M(f^{-1}(E)) = 0$ if $\text{Vol}_N(E) = 0$, and P -differentiable a.e. and the Jacobian $J_f > 0$ a.e. in M .
- 4). $\text{Lip } f$ is the minimal Q -weak upper gradient of f ;
- 5). $\text{Vol}_M(\mathcal{B}_f) = 0$, where $\mathcal{B}_f$ is the branch set of f , i.e. the set of all $x \in M$ such that f fails to be a local homeomorphism at x ;

As the previous overview indicates, to establish the theory of metric quasiregular mappings between general metric measure spaces, the right conditions imposing on the underlying spaces are that the metric measure spaces have locally bounded geometry. Theorem B seems to suggest that when our underlying metric spaces have nice geometry so that a (geometric) differentiability theory for mappings exists, then the basic properties of metric quasiregular mappings remain valid. It is then an interesting problem to investigate to what extent the differentiability theory helps in establishing the more advanced properties of quasiregular mappings; see Section 6 for those natural open problems.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains preliminaries on Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces. In Section 3, we introduce the basic results on the geometry of subRiemannian manifolds. In Section 4, we generalize the notion of P -differentiability of Pansu [50] and Margulis-Mostow [40] to the setting of mappings between general subRiemannian manifolds and prove Theorem A. Section 5 contains a detailed study of quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds. In particular, we investigate all the basic analytic properties of a quasiregular mapping from the differentiable point of view and prove Theorem B. The final section, Section 6, contains a list of interesting open questions for further research.

2. SOBOLEV SPACES ON METRIC MEASURE SPACES

In this section, we will briefly introduce the Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces based on an upper gradient approach. For detailed description of this approach, see the monograph [29].

2.1. Metric measure spaces.

Definition 2.1. A *metric measure space* is defined to be a triple (X, d, μ) , where (X, d) is a separable metric space and μ is a nontrivial locally finite Borel regular measure on X .

Definition 2.2. A Borel regular measure μ on a metric space (X, d) is called a *doubling measure* if every ball in X has positive and finite measure and there exists a constant $C_\mu \geq 1$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C_\mu \mu(B(x, r))$$

for each $x \in X$ and $r > 0$. We call the triple (X, d, μ) a *doubling metric measure space* if μ is a doubling measure on X . We call (X, d, μ) an *Ahlfors Q -regular space* if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad C^{-1}r^Q \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq Cr^Q$$

for all balls $B(x, r) \subset X$ of radius $r < \text{diam } X$.

2.2. Modulus of a curve family. Let (X, d) be a metric space. A curve in X is a continuous map $\gamma : I \rightarrow X$, where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval. We call γ compact, open, or half-open, depending on the type of the interval I .

Given a compact curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X$, its length is the supremum of the numbers

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k d(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i-1})),$$

where the numbers t_i run over all finite sequences of points of the form

$$a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k = b.$$

If γ is not compact, its length is defined to be the supremum of the lengths of the compact subcurves of γ . Thus, every curve has a well defined length in the extended nonnegative reals, and we denote it by $l(\gamma)$.

A curve is said to be *rectifiable* if its length $l(\gamma)$ is finite, and *locally rectifiable* if each of its compact subcurves is rectifiable. For any rectifiable curve γ there are its associated length function $s_\gamma : I \rightarrow [0, l(\gamma)]$ and a unique 1-Lipschitz map $\gamma_s : [0, l(\gamma)] \rightarrow X$ such that $\gamma = \gamma_s \circ s_\gamma$. The curve γ_s is the arc length parametrization of γ .

When γ is rectifiable, and parametrized by arclength on the interval $[a, b]$, the integral of a Borel function $\rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ along γ is

$$\int_\gamma \rho ds = \int_0^{l(\gamma)} \rho(\gamma_s(t)) dt.$$

Similarly, the line integral of a Borel function $\rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ over a locally rectifiable curve γ is defined to be the supremum of the integral of ρ over all compact subcurves of γ .

Let $X = (X, d, \mu)$ be a metric measure space as defined in (2.1). Let Γ a family of curves in X . A Borel function $\rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is admissible for Γ if for every locally rectifiable curves $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq 1.$$

The p -modulus of Γ is defined as

$$\text{Mod}_p(\Gamma) = \inf \left\{ \int_X \rho^p \, d\mu : \rho \text{ is admissible for } \Gamma \right\}.$$

2.3. Sobolev spaces based on upper gradients. Let $X = (X, d, \mu)$ be a metric measure space and $Z = (Z, d_Z)$ be a metric space.

Definition 2.3. A Borel function $g : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called an *upper gradient* for a map $f : X \rightarrow Z$ if for every rectifiable curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X$, we have the inequality

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\gamma} g \, ds \geq d_Z(f(\gamma(b)), f(\gamma(a))).$$

If inequality (2.5) merely holds for p -almost every compact curve, then g is called a *p -weak upper gradient* for f . When the exponent p is clear, we omit it.

The concept of upper gradient were introduced in [27]. It was initially called “very weak gradient”, but the befitting term “upper gradient” was soon suggested. Functions with p -integrable p -weak upper gradients were subsequently studied in [38], while the theory of Sobolev spaces based on upper gradient was systematically developed in [57] and [10].

By [29, Lemma 5.2.3], f has a p -weak upper gradient in $L^p_{loc}(X)$ if and only if it has an actual upper gradient in $L^p_{loc}(X)$.

A p -weak upper gradient g of f is *minimal* if for every p -weak upper gradient $\tilde{g}$ of f , $\tilde{g} \geq g$ μ -almost everywhere. If f has an upper gradient in $L^p_{loc}(X)$, then f has a unique (up to sets of μ -measure zero) minimal p -weak upper gradient by the following result from [29, Theorem 5.3.23]. In this situation, we denote the minimal upper gradient by g_f .

Proposition 2.4. The collection of all p -integrable p -weak upper gradients of a map $u : X \rightarrow Z$ is a closed convex lattice inside $L^p(X)$ and, if nonempty, contains a unique element of smallest L^p -norm. In particular, if a map has a p -integrable p -weak upper gradient, then it has a minimal p -weak upper gradient.

In view of the above result, the minimal p -weak upper gradient ρ_u should be thought of as a substitute for $|\nabla u|$, or the length of a gradient, for functions defined in metric measure spaces.

Let $\tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z)$ denote the collection of all maps $u \in L^p(X, Z)$ that have an upper gradient in $L^p(X)$. We equip it with seminorm

$$(2.6) \quad \|u\|_{\tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z)} = \|u\|_{L^p(X, Z)} + \|g_u\|_{L^p(X)},$$

where g_u is the minimal p -weak upper gradient of u guaranteed by Proposition 2.4.

We obtain a normed space $N^{1,p}(X, Z)$ by passing to equivalence classes of functions in $\tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z)$, where $u_1 \sim u_2$ if and only if $\|u_1 - u_2\|_{\tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z)} = 0$. Thus

$$(2.7) \quad N^{1,p}(X, Z) := \tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z) / \{u \in \tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z) : \|u\|_{\tilde{N}^{1,p}(X, Z)} = 0\}.$$

Let $\tilde{N}_{loc}^{1,p}(X, Z)$ be the vector space of functions $u : X \rightarrow Z$ with the property that every point $x \in X$ has a neighborhood U_x in X such that $u \in \tilde{N}^{1,p}(U_x, Z)$. Two functions u_1 and u_2 in $\tilde{N}_{loc}^{1,p}(X, Z)$ are said to be equivalent if every point $x \in X$ has a neighborhood U_x in X such that the restrictions $u_1|_{U_x}$ and $u_2|_{U_x}$ determine the same element in $\tilde{N}^{1,p}(U_x, Z)$. The local Sobolev space $N_{loc}^{1,p}(X, Z)$ is the vector space of equivalent classes of functions in $\tilde{N}_{loc}^{1,p}(X, Z)$ under the preceding equivalence relation.

2.4. Spaces of locally bounded geometry.

Definition 2.5. We say that a metric measure space (X, d, μ) admits a $(1, p)$ -Poincaré inequality, $p \geq 1$, if there exist constants $C \geq 1$ and $\tau \geq 1$ such that

$$(2.8) \quad \int_B |u - u_B| d\mu \leq C \operatorname{diam}(B) \left(\int_{\tau B} \rho^p d\mu \right)^{1/p}$$

for all open balls B in X , for every function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is integrable on balls and for every upper gradient ρ of u in X .

Remark 2.6. By the result of Keith [35], one can change the class of functions in the definition of Poincaré inequalities whenever the underlying metric measure space is complete and doubling. More precisely, for such spaces, (2.8) holds for all measurable functions if and only if (2.8) holds for all compactly supported Lipschitz functions and their compactly supported Lipschitz upper gradients.

Definition 2.7. Let (X, d, μ) be a pathwise connected metric measure space. We call X a Q -Loewner space if there is a function $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\operatorname{Mod}_Q(\Gamma(E, F, X)) \geq \phi(\zeta(E, F))$$

for every non-degenerate compact connected sets $E, F \subset X$, where

$$\zeta(E, F) = \frac{\operatorname{dist}(E, F)}{\min\{\operatorname{diam} E, \operatorname{diam} F\}}.$$

By [27, Theorem 3.6], if X is Ahlfors Q -regular, and Q -Loewner, then

$$(2.9) \quad \operatorname{Mod}_Q(\Gamma(E, F, X)) \geq C \left(\log \zeta(E, F) \right)^{1-Q}$$

when $\zeta(E, F)$ is large enough with C depends only on the data of X . By [27, Corollary 5.13], a complete (or equivalently proper) Ahlfors Q -regular metric measure space that supports a $(1, Q)$ -Poincaré inequality is Q -Loewner.

Following [28], we introduce the notion of metric spaces of locally bounded geometry.

Definition 2.8. A metric measure space (X, d, μ) is said to be of *locally Q -bounded geometry*, $Q \geq 1$, if X is separable, pathwise connected, locally compact, and if there exist constants $C_0 \geq 1$, $0 < \lambda \leq 1$, and a decreasing function $\psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that each point $x \in X$ has a neighborhood U (with compact closure in X) so that

- $\mu(B_R) \leq C_0 R^Q$ whenever $B_R \subset U$ is a ball of radius $R > 0$;
- $\text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma(E, F, B_R)) \geq \psi(t)$ whenever $B_R \subset U$ is a ball of radius $R > 0$ and E and F are two disjoint, non-degenerate compact connected sets in $B_{\lambda R}$ with

$$\text{dist}(E, F) \leq t \cdot \min\{\text{diam } E, \text{diam } F\}.$$

In other words, a pathwise connected, locally compact space is of locally Q -bounded geometry if and only if it is *locally uniformly Ahlfors Q -regular* and *locally uniformly Q -Loewner*. In terms of Poincaré inequality, a pathwise connected, locally compact space is of locally Q -bounded geometry if and only if it is locally uniformly Ahlfors Q -regular and supports a local uniform $(1, Q)$ -Poincaré inequality. Here by saying locally uniformly Ahlfors Q -regular we mean that there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for each $x \in M$, there is a radius $r_x > 0$ so that (2.2) holds for all $0 < r < r_x$ with the constant C_0 , and by saying supporting a local uniform $(1, Q)$ -Poincaré inequality, we mean that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for each x , there exists a ball B centered at x (with radius depending on x) such that the Poincaré inequality (2.8) with exponent $p = Q$ holds with the constant C .

As a particular case, let us point out that every Riemannian n -manifold is of locally n -bounded geometry. More exotic examples can be found in [27, Section 6].

3. GEOMETRY OF EQUIREGULAR SUBRIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

Let M be a differentiable manifold of dimension n and fix a subbundle $H \subset TM$ of rank r . Define the following *flag of distributions* inductively for $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{H}^{(0)} &:= \{0\} \\ \mathcal{H}^{(1)} &:= \Gamma(H) \\ \mathcal{H}^{(k+1)} &:= \mathcal{H}^{(k)} + \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)\text{-span} \{[X, Z] : X \in \mathcal{H}^{(1)}, Z \in \mathcal{H}^{(k)}\}, \end{cases}$$

where $\Gamma(H)$ is the set of all smooth sections of H and for any set S of vector field, $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)\text{-span}(S)$ is the set of linear combinations of elements of S with coefficients in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$, which is the ring of smooth functions $M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

By definition we have

$$\{0\} \subset \mathcal{H}^{(1)} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{H}^{(k)} \subset \mathcal{H}^{(k+1)} \subset \dots \subset \text{Vec}(M).$$

For any point $p \in M$ we have a *pointwise flag*

$$\mathcal{H}_p^{(k)} := \{Z(p) : Z \in \mathcal{H}^{(k)}\} \subset T_p M.$$

To such a flag we associate some functions $M \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$:

ranks: $r_k(p) := \dim(\mathcal{H}_p^{(k)})$. Notice that $r = r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq n$.

growth vector: $n_k(p) := r_k(p) - r_{k-1}(p) = \dim(\mathcal{H}_p^{(k)} / \mathcal{D}_p^{(k-1)})$. Notice that $\sum_{i=1}^k n_i = r_k$. The function $p \mapsto (n_1(p), n_2(p), \dots) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is usually called *growth vector*.

step: $s(p) := \inf\{k : \mathcal{H}_p^{(k)} = T_p M, \text{ i.e., } r_k(p) = n\}$. Notice that if $s(p) < \infty$, then

$$\{0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_p^{(1)} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{H}_p^{(s(p))} = T_p M.$$

weight: for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$: $w_i := k \Leftrightarrow i \in \{r_{k-1} + 1, \dots, r_k\}$.

The subbundle H is said to be *equiregular* if r_k (hence n_k and s) are constant. It is said to be *bracket generating* if $s < \infty$.

Definition 3.1 (subRiemannian manifold). An *equiregular subRiemannian manifold* is a triple (M, H, g) where M is a smooth and connected manifold, $H \subset TM$ is a bracket generating and equiregular subbundle, and $g : H \times H \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is a smooth function whose restriction to each fiber H_p is a scalar product.

Definition 3.2 (subRiemannian distance). An absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is called *horizontal curve* (joining $\gamma(0)$ to $\gamma(1)$) if $\gamma'(t) \in H$ for almost every $t \in [0, 1]$.

The *length* of an horizontal curve γ is

$$l(\gamma) := \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\| dt.$$

We finally define the *subRiemannian distance*:

$$d(p, q) := \inf \{l(\gamma) : \gamma \text{ is a horizontal curve joining } p \text{ to } q\}.$$

A subRiemannian manifold can be endowed in a canonical way with a smooth volume Vol that is called *Popp measure*. The construction can be found in [3].

Definition 3.3 (Non-holonomic order). Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and $o \in M$. The *non-holonomic order of f at o* is defined as the maximum of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i < k$ and for any choice of horizontal vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_i \in \mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ it holds

$$X_1 X_2 \cdots X_i f(o) = 0.$$

Definition 3.4. Let $o \in M$. A system of coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_n) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ centered at o is a *system of privileged coordinates* if the function x_i has non-holonomic order w_i .

Privileged coordinates exists at all points of M . See [4, 46] for an insight in this argument.

3.1. Ball-Box Theorem. For each $p \in M$ and $X \in \Gamma(TM)$, we denote by $\exp_p(X)$ the value of $\gamma(1)$ at time 1 of the integral curve of the vector field X starting at p , i.e., the solution of

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = X_{\gamma(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(0) = p.$$

For $p \in M$, we define the *exponential coordinates* as

$$\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M$$

$$\Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n) := \exp_p(t_1 X_1 + \cdots + t_n X_n).$$

Notice that such map might be defined only on a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

The *box* with respect to $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is defined as

$$\text{Box}(r) := \{(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : |t_j| \leq r^{d_j}\},$$

where d_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, is the degree of X_j .

The following well-known comparison theorem is due to Mitchell, Gershkovich, Nagel-Stein-Wainger and is called the *Ball-Box Theorem* since compare the boxes $\text{Box}(r)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the balls $B(p, r)$ with respect to the cc-distance.

Theorem 3.5 (Ball-Box Theorem). Let M be an equiregular subRiemannian n -manifold of metric dimension $Q \geq 2$ and let Φ be some exponential coordinate map from a point $p \in M$ constructed with respect to some equiregular basis $X_1, \dots, X_n$. Then there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a radius $r_p > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(\text{Box}(C^{-1}r)) \subset B(p, r) \subset \Phi(\text{Box}(Cr))$$

for all $r \in (0, r_p)$.

Recall that a metric space X is said to be *linearly locally connected* (LLC) if there exists $\theta \geq 1$ such that for each $x \in X$ and all $0 < r \leq \text{diam } X$,

- (i)(θ -LLC-1) every two points $a, b \in B(x, r)$ can be joined in $B(x, \theta r)$, and
- (ii)(θ -LLC-2) every two points $a, b \in X \setminus \overline{B}(x, r)$ can be joined in $X \setminus \overline{B}(x, \theta^{-1}r)$.

Here, by joining a and b in B we mean that there exists a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow B$ with $\gamma(0) = a, \gamma(1) = b$.

As a particular consequence of Theorem 3.5, we point out that an equiregular subRiemannian manifold M is locally LLC and locally Ahlfors Q -regular, i.e. for each $x \in M$, there exists a radius $r_x > 0$ such that the metric space $(B(x, r), d)$ (d is the induced metric from M) is LLC and Ahlfors Q -regular (note that the constants associated to the LLC condition and the Ahlfors regularity condition (2.2) depend on the point x).

By the results from [34], an equiregular subRiemannian manifold locally supports a (1, 1)-Poincaré inequality (with the constant associated to the Poincaré inequality depending on the locality).

4. DIFFERENTIABILITY OF LIPSCHITZ MAPPINGS

This section devoted to prove Stepanov's Theorem A.

4.1. Tangent cone. Let (M, d) be a subRiemannian manifold with horizontal distribution $H \subset TM$. Since the results of this section are local, we can assume that H is generated by r smooth vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_r \in \Gamma(TM)$ that are linearly independent at every point.

We assume that at each point $o \in M$ a system of privileged coordinates is chosen. Let $\delta_\epsilon^o : U_\epsilon^o \rightarrow U_{\epsilon^{-1}}^o$ be the corresponding dilations, $\epsilon \in (0, +\infty)$, where U_ϵ^o is an open neighborhood of o . We assume $U_1^o \subset U_\epsilon^o$ for all $\epsilon \leq 1$. Note that we do not assume anything on the dependence of δ_ϵ^o on o . Each point is independent on the others.

It is a well known result that these dilations δ_ϵ^o permit to construct the metric tangent cone of (M, d) at $o \in M$. We next briefly expose the procedure.

For $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, define $X_j^{o, \epsilon} := \epsilon \cdot d\delta_\epsilon \circ X_j \circ \delta_\epsilon \in \Gamma(TU_1^o)$. Then there are $X_j^{o, 0} \in \Gamma(TU_1^o)$ such that $X_j^{o, \epsilon} \rightarrow X_j^{o, 0}$ uniformly on compact sets. Up to shrinking the set U_1^o , we can assume the convergence to be uniform on U_1^o . Notice that, for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, $(\delta_\epsilon)_* X_j^{o, 0} = d\delta_\epsilon \circ X_j^{o, 0} \circ \delta_\epsilon = \epsilon^{-1} X_j^{o, 0}$.

For all $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the vector fields $X_j^{o, \epsilon}$ define a subRiemannian metric d_ϵ^o on U_1^o . For $\epsilon \neq 0$, the metric space (U_1^o, d_ϵ^o) is isometric to a neighborhood of o in $(M, \epsilon^{-1}d)$. As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, d_ϵ^o converge uniformly on $U_1^o \times U_1^o$ to d_0^o . This implies that (U_1^o, d_0^o) is isometric to a neighborhood of the origin in the tangent cone of (M, d) at o .

We will always write d_0^o or just d^o for the tangent distance at the point o .

More can be said about the tangent cone. Let $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \Gamma(TU_1^o)$ be the Lie algebra generated by the vector fields $\{X_j^{o, 0}\}_{j=1}^r$. This is a finite dimensional, nilpotent, stratified Lie algebra, whose first layer is the span of $X_1^{o, 0}, \dots, X_r^{o, 0}$.

Recall that a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is *stratified* of step s and rank r if $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^s V_i$ with $\dim(V_1) = r$ and $[V_1, V_i] = V_{i+1}$ for all i . When we speak of a stratified Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ we mean that the stratification $V_1, \dots, V_s$ is chosen. A map $A : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s'} V'_i$ is a *morphism of stratified Lie algebras* if it commutes with Lie brackets and $A(V_i) \subset V'_i$.

Since a stratified Lie algebra is nilpotent, the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula is a finite sum and it defines a map $*$: $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ that makes $(\mathfrak{g}, *)$ into a Lie group. More precisely, $(\mathfrak{g}, *)$ is the unique simply connected Lie group whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}$. With this identification between Lie algebra and Lie group, any Lie algebra morphism is a Lie group morphism as well.

The group $\mathbb{G} = (\mathfrak{g}, *)$ becomes a *Carnot group* if V_1 is endowed by a scalar product and $\mathbb{G}$ is endowed with the induced left-invariant subRiemannian metric.

In the case of $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \Gamma(TU_1^o)$, the first layer is $V_1 = \text{span}\{X_1^{o, 0}, \dots, X_r^{o, 0}\}$, and the scalar product on V_1 is chosen by saying that $X_1^{o, 0}, \dots, X_r^{o, 0}$ is an orthonormal basis.

The exponential map for vector fields $\exp : \Gamma(TU_1^o) \rightarrow U_1^o$ (which is not globally defined), restricted to $\mathfrak{g}_o$ gives an isometry between an open neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{G}_o = \mathfrak{g}_o$ onto an open neighborhood of o in (U_1^o, d_0^o) . Moreover, by [11], we may start with some special privileged coordinates on U_1^o so that they correspond to exponential coordinates of the group $\mathbb{G}_o$. Therefore, if $\bar{o}$ is another point on another subRiemannian manifolds, and $A : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$ is a Lie algebra morphism, then we can see A as a map $U_1^o \rightarrow U_1^{\bar{o}}$ that is linear in these coordinates.

4.2. P -differentiability. Let $\bar{M}$ be a smooth manifold. We have on $\bar{M}$ all the same objects as on M , and we distinguish them by putting a bar on the ones for $\bar{M}$. Let $f : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$, $o \in M$ and $\bar{o} := f(o) \in \bar{M}$.

Definition 4.1 (P -Differential). We say that f is P -differentiable at o if there exists a morphism of graded Lie algebras $A : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$ such that

$$\lim_{\mathfrak{g}_o \ni X \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{d}(\exp(A[X])(\bar{o}), f(\exp(X)(o)))}{\|X\|} = 0$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is any homogeneous semi-norm on $\mathfrak{g}_o$. When f is P -differentiable at o , we write $Df(o)$ instead of A for the P -differential.

Notice that this definition of P -differential depends on a choice of two systems of privileged coordinates, one centered at o and the other at $\bar{o}$. However, different choices of privileged coordinates commutes by isomorphisms. More precisely, if $\mathfrak{g}'_o$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}'_o$ are the graded Lie algebras that arise from a different choice of privileged coordinates, then there are isomorphisms of graded Lie algebras $\phi : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}'_o$ and $\bar{\phi} : \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{\bar{o}} \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{g}}'_{\bar{o}}$ with the following property: for any map $f : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$ with $f(o) = \bar{o}$ and with a P -differential $A : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{\bar{o}}$, a morphism of Lie algebras $A' : \mathfrak{g}'_o \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{g}}'_{\bar{o}}$ is the P -differential of f at o if and only if the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_o & \xrightarrow{A} & \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{\bar{o}} \\ \phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{\phi} \\ \mathfrak{g}'_o & \xrightarrow{A'} & \bar{\mathfrak{g}}'_{\bar{o}} \end{array}$$

An easy way to prove the existence of such ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ is the following. First of all, notice that in this section we will prove the Rademacher's theorem without assuming any independence on the choice of coordinates. Therefore, we can apply this result to the identity map $\text{Id} : M \rightarrow M$ at a point $o \in M$, but using different coordinates in the domain and in the target. The P -differential of the Identity map gives the isomorphism of graded Lie algebras $\phi : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}'_o$.

With a slight abuse of notation, in privileged coordinates the P -differential is a linear map $Df(0) = Df(o) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{d}(Df(0)y, f(y))}{d(0, y)} = 0$$

or, in other words,

$$(4.2) \quad \bar{d}(f(o), f(y)) = \bar{d}(f(o), Df(0)y) + o(\bar{d}(f(o), Df(0)y)).$$

Indeed, privileged coordinates identify a neighborhood of a point o with a neighborhood of the origin 0 in the Carnot group tangent to M at o endowed with exponential coordinates.

Remark 4.2. If both M and $\bar{M}$ are Carnot groups, then our Definition 4.1 of P -differential is the same as the classical *Pansu differential*. Indeed, suppose for sake of simplicity that o and $\bar{o}$ are the neutral elements of M and $\bar{M}$ respectively. Then we can identify $\mathfrak{g}_o = \mathbb{G}_o = M$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}} = \mathbb{G}_{\bar{o}} = \bar{M}$ as sets through the exponential maps. As a homogeneous norm on $\mathfrak{g}_o$, we can choose $\|X\| := d(o, X)$. Therefore, cleaning up the notation in Definition 4.1, we have

$$\lim_{\mathfrak{g}_o \ni X \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{d}(\exp(A[X])(\bar{o}), f(\exp(X)(o)))}{\|X\|} = \lim_{\bar{M} \ni X \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{d}(A[X], f(X))}{d(o, X)} = 0,$$

which is the usual definition of Pansu differential.

Remark 4.3. Our Definition 4.1 of P -differential is still valid for subRiemannian manifolds that are not equiregular. We will not deal with that case, but we want to remark that our results are still valid in the non-equiregular case. The only point where one needs to be careful is that the P -differential may not be unique anymore.

As an example, let $M = \mathbb{R}$ with $X_1 = \partial_t$, and $\bar{M} = \mathbb{R}^3$ with

$$\bar{X}_1 := \partial_x, \quad \bar{X}_2 := y\partial_z, \quad \bar{X}_3 := \partial_y.$$

Notice that $\delta_\lambda(x, y, z) = (\lambda x, \lambda y, \lambda^2 z)$ are dilations of $\bar{M}$, i.e., the tangent cone of $\bar{M}$ at $(0, 0, 0)$ is $\bar{M}$ itself. In particular,

$$\bar{g}_{(0,0,0)} = \text{span}\{\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \bar{X}_3\} \oplus \text{span}\{\partial_z\} \subset \text{Vec}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Then it is easy to see that the mappings $A_a : \text{span}\{\partial_t\} \rightarrow \bar{g}_{(0,0,0)}$ defined by

$$A(\partial_t) = \bar{X}_1 + a\bar{X}_2$$

are all P -differentials of the map $f : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$, $f(t) := (t, 0, 0)$ at $(0, 0, 0)$.

4.3. A variant of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem. The aim of this section is show the following differentiation theorem, which will be used in our later proof of the Stepanov's theorem.

Proposition 4.4. For every $p \in M$ let $B_p \subset U_p^1$ be a compact neighborhood of p . Let $\Omega \subset M \times [0, 1]$ be an open neighborhood of $M \times \{0\}$ and let $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow M$, $(p, t) \mapsto \phi_t p$, be the flow of a vector field on M . If $h : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally integrable function, then, for almost all $o \in M$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o(B_o)}^\epsilon |h(\phi_s p) - h(o)| \, ds \, dp = 0$$

We will use a version of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem due to Federer [13, Theorem 2.9.8, Page 156–165].

Lemma 4.5. Define

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{V} := \{(p, \delta_\epsilon^p B_p) : p \in M, \epsilon \in (0, 1]\}.$$

The family $\mathcal{V}$ is a Vitali relation, in the sense of Federer [13, §2.8.16].

Proof. We do this using [13, Theorem 2.8.17]. Using Federer's notation, in our case we choose

$$\tau = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(p, \delta_\epsilon^p B_p) = \text{diam}_d(\delta_\epsilon^p B_p).$$

We need only to show that for (almost) all $o \in M$ (see [13, Theorem 2.8.4, Page 144–153] for the definition of $\hat{S}$):

$$(4.4) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\widehat{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o}|}{|\delta_\epsilon^o B_o|} < +\infty.$$

By definition we have

$$\widehat{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} = \bigcup \delta_\eta^p B_p$$

where the union is take on all $\delta_\eta^p B_p$ such that $\delta_\eta^p B_p \cap \delta_\epsilon^o B_o \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{diam}_d(\delta_\eta^p B_p) \leq 2 \text{diam}_d(\delta_\epsilon^o B_o)$. Hence

$$\widehat{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} \subset B_d(o, 3 \text{diam}_d(\delta_\epsilon^o B_o))$$

and we have to prove

$$(4.5) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_d(o, 3 \operatorname{diam}_d(\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o))|}{|\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o|} < +\infty.$$

First we claim that

$$\operatorname{diam}_d(\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o) = O(\epsilon)$$

Indeed, if $x \in B_o$, then

$$d(o, \delta_\epsilon^\circ x) = \epsilon \epsilon^{-1} d(\delta_\epsilon^\circ o, \delta_\epsilon^\circ x) = \epsilon d^{o, \epsilon}(o, x)$$

where $d^{o, \epsilon}(o, x) \rightarrow d^{o, 0}(o, x)$ uniformly in x as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, and therefore $d(o, \delta_\epsilon^\circ x) = O(\epsilon)$, uniformly in x .

Thanks to the Ball-Box theorem 3.5 we have

$$|B_d(o, r)| \sim r^Q$$

where Q is the homogeneous dimension of M at o .

Finally, since δ_ϵ° has determinant equal to ϵ^Q in one coordinate system, we have

$$|\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o| \sim \epsilon^Q,$$

which leads to (4.5). □

Lemma 4.6. Define

$$R_\epsilon(p) := \int_0^\epsilon |h(\phi_s p) - h(p)| \, ds.$$

Then for a.e. $p \in M$ we have

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} R_\epsilon(p) = 0.$$

Proof. Applying the Lebesgue differentiation theorem to the function $t \mapsto h(\phi_t q)$ for any $q \in M$, we obtain that for almost all (q, t)

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\epsilon |h(\phi_{t+s} q) - h(\phi_t q)| \, ds = 0,$$

which implies (4.6) holds for $p = \phi_t q$. Since the map $(q, t) \mapsto \phi_t q$ is Lipschitz and surjective, it maps a set of full measure into a set of full measure, therefore for a.e. $p \in M$ (4.6) holds. □

Lemma 4.7. Let $F \subset M$ be a set. Then for almost all $o \in F$

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o \setminus F|}{|\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o|} = 0.$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{V}$, defined in (4.3), is a Vitali relation, the claim follows by applying the Lebesgue differentiation theorem to the characteristic function χ_F of F . □

Proof of Proposition 4.4. We need to show that for almost all $o \in M$

$$(4.8) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\delta_\epsilon^\circ B_o} \int_0^\epsilon |h(\phi_s p) - h(o)| \, ds \, dp = 0$$

Thanks to Egorov Theorem, for every $\eta > 0$ there is $F \subset M$ such that $|M \setminus F| \leq \eta$ and R_ϵ converge uniformly to 0 on F . Since η is arbitrary, it suffices to show that (4.8) holds for almost all $o \in F$.

Since $\mathcal{V}$, defined in (4.3), is a Vitali family, by Lemma 4.7, we deduce that for a.e. $o \in F$ (4.7) holds and

$$(4.9) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} |h(p) - h(o)| dp = 0.$$

For such an o we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} \int_0^\epsilon |h(\phi_s p) - h(o)| ds dp \\ & \leq \underbrace{\int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} \int_0^\epsilon |h(\phi_s p) - h(p)| ds dp}_A + \underbrace{\int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} |h(p) - h(o)| dp}_B \end{aligned}$$

where part B converges to 0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ because of (4.9). For part A , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} R_\epsilon(p) dp = \frac{1}{|\delta_\epsilon^o B_o|} \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o \cap F} R_\epsilon(p) dp + \frac{1}{|\delta_\epsilon^o B_o|} \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o \setminus F} R_\epsilon(p) dp \\ &\leq \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} R_\epsilon(p) \chi_F dp + C \frac{|\delta_\epsilon^o B_o \setminus F|}{|\delta_\epsilon^o B_o|}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is some constant that bounds R_ϵ , which exists because h is locally integrable. It is now clear that A converges to 0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. $\square$

4.4. Blow-up of Lipschitz functions. Let $E \subset M$ be closed and let $f : E \rightarrow \bar{M}$ be an L -Lipschitz function. For every $o \in M$ let $B_o \subset M$ be a d -ball centered at o such that the dilations δ_ϵ^o are well defined for $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. Define the functions

$$f^{o,\epsilon} := \bar{\delta}_\epsilon^o \circ f \circ \delta_\epsilon^o$$

Thanks to the next Lemma 4.8, we may assume that $f^{o,\epsilon}$ is well defined on $B_o \cap E$ for every $o \in E$.

Define with these B_p

$$\mathcal{V} := \{(p, \delta_\epsilon^p B_p) : p \in M, \epsilon \in (0, 1]\}.$$

Lemma 4.5 implies that $\mathcal{V}$ is a Vitali relation, and hence a.e. $o \in E$ is a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E .

Thanks to Lemma 4.14, we have a sort of equicontinuity of $f^{o,\epsilon}$ at almost every point of E . Our main step is to show that for a.e. $o \in E$ all accumulation points of $f^{o,\epsilon}$ coincide and the rest of the section is dedicated to the proof of these facts.

Lemma 4.8. For every $o \in E$, setting $\bar{o} = f(o) \in \bar{M}$, there are U^o and $U^{\bar{o}}$ open neighborhoods of o and $\bar{o}$ respectively such that $U^o \subset U_1^o$ and $U^{\bar{o}} \subset U_1^{\bar{o}}$ and

$$f^{o,\epsilon} := \bar{\delta}_\epsilon^o \circ f \circ \delta_\epsilon^o$$

is a well defined map $U^o \cap E \rightarrow U^{\bar{o}}$.

Proof. Fix $o \in E$ and choose $r > 0$ such that $B_{\bar{d}_0}(\bar{o}, r) \subset U_1^{\bar{o}}$. Note that if $d_0^{\bar{o}}(\bar{o}, p) \leq r$, then $\delta_{\epsilon} p$ is defined. Hence $\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \delta_{\epsilon} p = p$ is well defined. In other words,

$$B_{\bar{d}_0}(\bar{o}, \epsilon r) = \bar{\delta}_{\epsilon}(B_{\bar{d}_0}(\bar{o}, r)) \subset U_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}}.$$

Since both $d_{\epsilon}^o \rightarrow d_0^o$ and $\bar{d}_{\epsilon}^{\bar{o}} \rightarrow d_0^{\bar{o}}$ uniformly, there are constants $A, B > 0$ such that

$$\epsilon^{-1} d(o, \delta_{\epsilon} p) \leq A d_0^o(o, p)$$

and

$$\bar{d}_0^{\bar{o}}(\bar{o}, \bar{p}) \leq B \bar{d}(\bar{o}, \bar{p}).$$

Therefore

$$\bar{d}_0^{\bar{o}}(\bar{o}, f(\delta_{\epsilon} p)) \leq B \bar{d}(\bar{o}, f(\delta_{\epsilon} p)) \leq B L d(o, \delta_{\epsilon} p) \leq B L A \epsilon d_0^o(o, p).$$

Hence a sufficient condition for the existence of $\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(f(\delta_{\epsilon} p))$ is that

$$d_0^o(o, p) \leq \frac{r}{B L A}.$$

□

We introduce the following type of convergence, adapted to the fact that $f^{p, \epsilon}$ is not defined in a neighborhood of p .

Definition 4.9. Let $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ be a sequence. We say that $f^{p, \epsilon_k} \rightarrow g$ uniformly on B_p if

- (1) $d_H(\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E \cap B_p, B_p) \rightarrow 0$, where d_H is the Hausdorff distance between sets, and
- (2) $\sup \left\{ d(f^{p, \epsilon_k}(q), g(q)) : q \in \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E \cap B_p \right\} \rightarrow 0$.

One of the features of this definition is the following property:

Lemma 4.10. If $f^{p, \epsilon_k} \rightarrow g$ uniformly on B_p and if $\tilde{f} : M \rightarrow N$ is any continuous extension of f outside E , then $\tilde{f}^{p, \epsilon_k}$ converges uniformly to g on B_p .

Proof. On one side, $\tilde{f}^{p, \epsilon_k}$ already converge on $\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E \cap B_p$. On the other hand, $\tilde{f}^{p, \epsilon_k}$ are uniformly continuous on B_p and therefore the hypothesis $d_H(\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E \cap B_p, B_p) \rightarrow 0$ implies the uniform convergence on $B_p \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E$. □

Lemma 4.11. If $p \in E$ is a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E , then $d_H(\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E \cap B_p, B_p) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Assume that the thesis is false. Then, up to passing to a subsequence, there is $a > 0$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $x_k \in B_p$ with

$$B(x_k, a) \subset B_p \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p E$$

i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p B_p \setminus E|}{|\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p B_p|} \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p B(x_k, a)|}{|\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}}^p B_p|} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|B(x_k, a)|}{|B_p|} > 0,$$

i.e., p is not a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E . □

Definition 4.12. Let (A, d) and $(B, \bar{d})$ be metric spaces, where A is separable and B is compact. A family of functions $\{f_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0,1]}$, $f_\epsilon : A \rightarrow B$, is *eventually equicontinuous* if

$$(4.10) \quad \forall \eta > 0, \exists \delta > 0, \forall \epsilon \in (0, \delta), \forall p, q \in A \\ d(p, q) \leq \delta \Rightarrow \bar{d}(f_\epsilon(p), f_\epsilon(q)) \leq \eta.$$

The Arzelà-Ascoli theorem holds for this notion of equicontinuity as well. The proof traces the proof of the usual Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, see for example [56].

Proposition 4.13 (Arzelà-Ascoli). Let $\{f_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0,1]}$ be an eventually equicontinuous family of functions. Then for every sequence $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ there is a subsequence $\epsilon_{k_i} \rightarrow 0$ such that $f_{\epsilon_{k_i}}$ converge uniformly on A .

Lemma 4.14 (Equicontinuity of $f^{o,\epsilon}$). Let $o \in E$ be a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E . Then the family $\{f^{o,\epsilon}\}_\epsilon$ is eventually equicontinuous.

Proof. Set $\bar{o} := f(o)$.

First, since $d_\epsilon^o \rightarrow d_0^o$ and $\bar{d}_\epsilon^o \rightarrow \bar{d}_0^o$ uniformly, then it holds

$$\forall \eta > 0, \exists \delta > 0, \forall \epsilon \in (0, \delta), \forall p, q \quad d_0^o(p, q) \leq \delta \Rightarrow d_\epsilon^o(p, q) \leq \eta$$

and

$$\forall \eta > 0, \exists \delta > 0, \forall \epsilon \in (0, \delta), \forall p, q \quad \bar{d}_\epsilon^o(p, q) \leq \delta \Rightarrow \bar{d}_0^o(p, q) \leq \eta$$

On the other hand, since $f^{o,\epsilon}$ are L -Lipschitz with respect to d_ϵ for all ϵ , it follows easily that

$$\bar{d}_\epsilon^o(f^{o,\epsilon}(p), f^{o,\epsilon}(q)) \leq L d_\epsilon^o(p, q).$$

Together, these two facts give the proof of (4.10). $\square$

Finally, we have the following lemma that will be used later

Lemma 4.15. Suppose that $f^{o,\epsilon} \rightarrow f^{o,0}$ uniformly and that there is a morphism of Lie algebras $A : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$ such that

$$f^{o,0}(\exp(X)(o)) = \exp(A[X])(\bar{o}).$$

Then f is P-differentiable at o and $Df(o) = A$.

Proof. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a homogeneous norm on $\mathfrak{g}_o$. Then any vector of norm ϵ can be written as $\delta_\epsilon X$ with $\|X\| = 1$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{d}(\exp(A[\delta_\epsilon X])(\bar{o}), f(\exp(\delta_\epsilon X)(o)))}{\|\delta_\epsilon X\|} &= \epsilon^{-1} \bar{d}(f^{o,0}(\exp(\delta_\epsilon X)(o)), f(\exp(\delta_\epsilon X)(o))) \\ &= \epsilon^{-1} \bar{d}(\bar{\delta}_\epsilon f^{o,0}(\exp(X)(o)), \bar{\delta}_\epsilon \bar{\delta}_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} f(\delta_\epsilon \exp(X)(o))) \\ &= \bar{d}_\epsilon^o(f^{o,0}(\exp(X)(o)), f^{o,\epsilon}(\exp(X)(o))) \end{aligned}$$

Since both d_ϵ^o and $f^{o,\epsilon}$ converge uniformly, we get

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \bar{d}_\epsilon^o(f^{o,0}(\exp(X)(o)), f^{o,\epsilon}(\exp(X)(o))) = 0$$

and the limit is uniform in X . $\square$

4.5. Blow-up of horizontal vector fields. Let $W = \sum_{j=1}^r w_j X_j$ be a horizontal vector field and let $(p, t) \mapsto \phi_t p$ be its flow.

Set $F(p, t) := f(\phi_t p)$. Then F is well-defined on $\{(p, t) : \phi_t p \in E\}$. Since

$$\bar{d}(f(\phi_t p), f(\phi_s q)) \leq Ld(\phi_t p, \phi_s q),$$

F is locally $\tilde{L}$ -Lipschitz, where $\tilde{L}$ depends only on the Lipschitz constant of f and the Lipschitz constant of ϕ on a compact set.

4.5.1. Extension of F on $M \times \mathbb{R}$. We seek an extension of F on $M \times \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (1) $F(p, t + s) = F(\phi_t p, s)$ for all $p \in M$ and all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi_t p$ exists and
- (2) for each $p \in M$ the curve $t \mapsto F(p, t)$ is Lipschitz.

We first extend F on $E \times \mathbb{R}$ in such a way that each curve $t \mapsto F(p, t)$ is $\tilde{L}$ -Lipschitz.

More precisely: for $p \in E$ define $I_p := \{t \in \mathbb{R} : \phi_t p \in E\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Since E is closed, I_p is closed as well. Let $\hat{t} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I_p$. Then there are two cases. First, there are $t_1, t_2 \in I_p$ with $\hat{t} \in (t_1, t_2) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus I_p$. Then

$$\bar{d}(f(\phi_{t_1} p), f(\phi_{t_2} p)) \leq Ld(\phi_{t_1} p, \phi_{t_2} p) \leq \tilde{L}|t_1 - t_2|.$$

Therefore there is a geodesic $\gamma : [t_1, t_2] \rightarrow \bar{M}$ joining $f(\phi_{t_1} p)$ to $f(\phi_{t_2} p)$ with constant velocity, i.e. $\tilde{L}$ -Lipschitz. In this case, we define $F(p, t) = \gamma(t)$ for $t \in (t_1, t_2)$.

In the second case it happens that there is $t_1 \in I_p$ such that $\hat{t} \in (-\infty, t_1) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus I_p$ or $t \in (t_1, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus I_p$. Then we set $F(p, t) = F(p, t_1)$.

Finally, on the set $\{p : \text{there exists } t \text{ such that } \phi_t p \in E\}$, we may extend F using the rule $F(p, t + s) = F(\phi_t p, s)$. For p outside of this set, we simply define $F(p, t) = \bar{p}$ for some fixed point $\bar{p} \in \bar{M}$.

4.5.2. Blow up of F . There are $h_j : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, \bar{r}\}$ such that for a.e. (p, t)

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(p, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(p, t) \bar{X}_j(F(p, t)).$$

Notice that h_j are locally bounded and that

$$h_j(p, t + s) = h_j(\phi_t p, s)$$

whenever $\phi_t p$ makes sense. This implies that for a.e. $p \in M$ there exists the derivative

$$\left. \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0}(p, 0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(p, 0) \bar{X}_j(F(p, 0))$$

The aim of this section is to blow-up both manifolds M and $\bar{M}$ keeping track of the map F . The result is, in some sense, the flow of a left-invariant vector field on $\bar{M}$; See Proposition 4.17.

For $o \in M$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ we have the vector fields

$$W^{o, \epsilon} := \epsilon \cdot d\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o \circ W \circ \delta_\epsilon^o$$

whose flow is denoted by $\phi_t^{o, \epsilon} p := \exp(tW^{o, \epsilon})(p)$. It's well-known that $W^{o, \epsilon} \rightarrow W^{o, 0} = \sum_{j=1}^r w_j(o) X_j^{o, 0}$ uniformly on compact sets and so $\phi^{o, \epsilon} \rightarrow \phi^{o, 0}$.

For $o \in M$, $\bar{o} := F(o, 0)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, set

$$F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) := \bar{\delta}_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} F(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t).$$

Notice that $F^{o,\epsilon}(p, 0) = f^{o,\epsilon}(p)$ if $\delta_{\epsilon}^o p \in E$.

Lemma 4.16. For all $o \in E$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(4.11) \quad F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) = f^{o,\epsilon}(\phi_t^{o,\epsilon} p),$$

if both sides are well defined. Moreover

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{\partial F^{o,\epsilon}}{\partial t}(p, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) \bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t))$$

Proof. Fix p and set $\gamma(t) = \phi_t p$. Then $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma'(t) = W(\gamma(t))$. Define $\eta_{\epsilon}(t) = \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(\gamma(\epsilon t))$. Then $\eta_{\epsilon}(0) = \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(p)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'_{\epsilon}(t) &= d\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o[\epsilon \gamma'(\epsilon t)] = \epsilon d\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o[W(\gamma(\epsilon t))] \\ &= \epsilon d\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o[W(\delta_{\epsilon}^o \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o \gamma(\epsilon t))] = W^{o,\epsilon}(\eta_{\epsilon}(t)) \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\eta_{\epsilon}(t) = \exp(tW^{o,\epsilon})(\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(p))$. In other words $\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(\phi_{\epsilon t} p) = \phi_t^{o,\epsilon}(\delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} p)$. Hence, if $\phi_{\epsilon t} \delta_{\epsilon}^o p \in E$, then

$$\begin{aligned} F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) &= \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} F(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) = \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} \circ f \circ \phi_{\epsilon t} \delta_{\epsilon}^o p \\ &= \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} \circ \delta_{\epsilon}^o \circ \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o \circ f \circ \phi_{\epsilon t} \delta_{\epsilon}^o p = f^{o,\epsilon}(\phi_t^{o,\epsilon} p), \end{aligned}$$

which gives (4.11). Regarding (4.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F^{o,\epsilon}}{\partial t}(p, t) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} F(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) = \epsilon d\bar{\delta}_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) = \\ &= \epsilon d\bar{\delta}_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) \bar{X}_j(F(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t)) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) \epsilon d\bar{\delta}_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} \bar{X}_j(\bar{\delta}_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^{\bar{o}} \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o F(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(\delta_{\epsilon}^o p, \epsilon t) \bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 4.17. Let $o \in E$ be a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E and a $\mathcal{V}$ -Lebesgue point of h_j for all j . Let $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ be a sequence such that f^{o,ϵ_k} converge uniformly to $g : B_o \rightarrow \bar{M}$. Then

$$\exp \left(t \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(o, 0) \bar{X}_j^{o,0} \right) (g(p)) = g \left(\exp \left(t \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} w_j(o) X_j^{o,0} \right) (p) \right).$$

Since our notation is getting heavier and heavier, we will drop the subscript k in ϵ_k and write just ϵ .

Proof. Define

$$G(p, t) = g\left(\exp\left(t \sum_{j=1}^r w_j(o) X_j^{o,0}\right)(p)\right)$$

where $w_j \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ are the components of W with respect to $X_1, \dots, X_r$. Now considering everything in coordinates, the curve

$$\gamma_p(t) = g(p) + \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(o, 0) \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s)) \, ds$$

is well defined for all p . Notice that $\gamma_p(0) = g(p)$ and $\gamma'_p(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(o, 0) \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, t))$, but in coordinates, it is not assumed that $\gamma'_p(t) \in T_{G(p,t)}\bar{M}$.

Our aim is to show that actually

$$\gamma_p(t) = G(p, t).$$

For this, we will prove that there exists a neighborhood K of o such that for t sufficiently small,

$$(4.13) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_K |F^{o, \epsilon_k}(p, t) - G(p, t)| \, dp = 0$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_K |F^{o, \epsilon_k}(p, t) - \gamma_p(t)| \, dp = 0.$$

The proof of (4.13) is given in Lemma 4.19 below and we next prove (4.14).

Notice that thanks to (4.12) we have

$$F^{o, \epsilon}(p, t) = F^{o, \epsilon}(p, 0) + \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(\delta_\epsilon^o p, \epsilon s) \bar{X}_j^{o, \epsilon}(F^{o, \epsilon}(p, s)) \, ds.$$

For $K = \delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_K \left| F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) - g(p) - \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_j(o, 0) \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s)) \, ds \right| \, dp \\
& \leq \int_K |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, 0) - g(p)| \, dp \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} \int_K \int_0^t |h_j(\delta_\epsilon^o p, \epsilon s) \bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - h_j(o, 0) \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s))| \, ds \, dp \\
& \leq \underbrace{\int_{B_o} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, 0) - g(p)| \, dp}_{(a)} \\
& \quad + \underbrace{\int_{B_o} \int_0^t |h_j(\delta_\epsilon^o p, \epsilon s) - h_j(o, 0)| \cdot |\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s))| \, ds \, dp}_{(b)} \\
& \quad + \underbrace{\int_K \int_0^t |h_j(o, 0)| |\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s))| \, ds \, dp}_{(c)}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we next estimate the three parts.

The proof of (a) $\rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ is given in Lemma 4.18 below.

To estimate part (b), notice that $|\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s))| \leq C$. We may use a change of variable and Proposition 4.4 to infer that

$$\int_{B_o} \int_0^t |h_j(\delta_\epsilon^o p, \epsilon s) - h_j(o, 0)| \, dt \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon \cdot |\delta_\epsilon^o B_o|} \int_{\delta_\epsilon^o B_o} \int_0^\epsilon |h_j(p, s) - h_j(o, 0)| \, ds \, dp \rightarrow 0$$

Similar, to estimate part (c), we notice that $|h_j| \leq C$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_K \int_0^t |\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s))| \, ds \, dp \\
& \leq \int_0^t \int_K |\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s))| \, dp \, ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t \int_K |\bar{X}_j^{o,0}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s))| \, dp \, ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Since $\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon} \rightarrow \bar{X}_j^{o,0}$ uniformly,

$$|\bar{X}_j^{o,\epsilon}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s))| \leq \rho(\epsilon)$$

for a function $\rho(\epsilon)$, independent on $F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)$, with the property that $\rho(\epsilon_k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that the first term in (4.15) tends to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Regarding the second term in (4.15), observe that $\bar{X}_j^{o,0}$ is Lipschitz on compact sets. So we may use Lemma 4.19 below to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \int_K |\bar{X}_j^{o,0}(F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s)) - \bar{X}_j^{o,0}(G(p, s))| \, dp \, ds \\ & \leq C \int_0^t \int_K |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, s) - G(p, s)| \, dp \, ds \\ & \leq C \int_0^t \int_{B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(p) - g(p)| \, dp + C |B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E| \, ds \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

from which (4.14) follows. $\square$

Lemma 4.18.

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_o} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, 0) - g(p)| \, dp = 0$$

Proof. Since $F(B_o, 0)$ is bounded in $\bar{M}$ and since o is a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_o} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, 0) - g(p)| \, dp \\ & \leq \int_{B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(p) - g(p)| \, dp + \int_{B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, 0) - g(p)| \, dp \\ & \leq \int_{B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(p) - g(p)| \, dp + C |B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 4.19. For t sufficiently close to 0, it holds

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) - G(p, t)| \, dp = 0.$$

More precisely

$$\int_{\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}^o B_o} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) - G(p, t)| \, dp \leq \int_{B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(p) - g(p)| \, dp + C |B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E|$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Proof. Choose t small enough such that $\phi_t^{o,\epsilon}(\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \subset \delta_{\frac{1}{2}}^o B_o$ and $(\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \delta_{\frac{1}{2}}^o B_o \subset B_o$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \cap (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E &= (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \left(\phi_t^{o,\epsilon}(\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E \right) \\ &\subset (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \left(\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}^o B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E \right) \subset B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \setminus (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E &= (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \left(\phi_t^{o,\epsilon}(\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E \right) \\ &\subset (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \left(\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}^o B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E \right) \subset B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) - G(p, t)| \, dp \\
&= \int_{(\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \cap (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(\phi_t^{o,\epsilon} p) - g(\phi_t^{o,0} p)| \, dp + \int_{(\delta_{\frac{1}{4}}^o B_o) \setminus (\phi_t^{o,\epsilon})^{-1} \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) - G(p, t)| \, dp \\
&= C \int_{B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(p) - g(p)| \, dp + \int_{B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |F^{o,\epsilon}(p, t) - G(p, t)| \, dp \\
(4.16) \quad & \leq \int_{B_o \cap \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E} |f^{o,\epsilon}(p) - g(p)| \, dp + C |B_o \setminus \delta_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}^o E|,
\end{aligned}$$

where (4.16) converges to 0 as $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$. $\square$

4.6. Stepanov's theorem.

Proposition 4.20 (Rademacher's Theorem). Let $E \subset M$ be a Borel set and $f : E \rightarrow \bar{M}$ a Lipschitz map. Then f is P -differentiable a.e. in E .

Notice that we cannot deduce the differentiability of Lipschitz functions $f : E \rightarrow \bar{M}$ from the differentiability of global Lipschitz functions $f : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$, because in subRiemannian geometry we cannot extend Lipschitz functions.

Proof. For $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \bar{r}\}$, let $h_{kj}(p, t)$ be such that, setting

$$F_k(p, t) = f(\exp(tX_k)(p)),$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial F_k}{\partial t}(p, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_{kj}(p, t) \bar{X}_j(F_k(p, t)).$$

Let $o \in E$ be a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E and a $\mathcal{V}$ -Lebesgue point for all h_{kj} . Almost all $o \in E$ have this properties.

Set $\bar{o} = f(o)$. We want to define a morphism of Lie algebras $A : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$. Remind that $A : \mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$ is a morphism of Lie algebras if and only if $A : \mathbb{G}_o \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{\bar{o}}$ is a morphism of Lie groups, under the identification $\mathfrak{g} = \mathbb{G}$ as in Section 4.1.

Set $\mathfrak{X} := \{tX_i^{o,0} : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Remind that $\mathfrak{X}$ generate $\mathbb{G}_o$ as a Lie group.

Define $A : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$ as

$$A[tX_j^{o,0}] := t \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{r}} h_{kj}(o, 0) \bar{X}_j^{o,0} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}.$$

Let $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ be a sequence such that f^{o,ϵ_k} converge to some g . By Proposition 4.17 we have

$$(4.17) \quad \exp(A[tX_j^{o,0}])(g(p)) = g(\exp(tX_j^{o,0})(p)).$$

Let $V \in \mathfrak{g}_o$. Then there are $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that $V = \xi_1 * \dots * \xi_\ell$. So we have

$$\exp(V)(p) = \exp(\xi_1 * \dots * \xi_\ell)(p) = \exp(\xi_1) \circ \dots \circ \exp(\xi_\ell)(p)$$

and therefore, iterating (4.17),

$$(4.18) \quad g(\exp(V)(p)) = \exp(A\xi_1 \bar{*} \dots \bar{*} A\xi_\ell)(g(p))$$

If we take $p = o$, then (4.18) becomes

$$g(\exp(V)(o)) = \exp(A\xi_1 \bar{*} \dots \bar{*} A\xi_\ell)(\bar{o})$$

Since the right hand side does not depend on the sequence $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, g is unique, i.e. $f^{o, \epsilon} \rightarrow g$ uniformly as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Moreover, since we can choose $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell$ depending smoothly on V , g is smooth.

On the other side, now A can be extended to a map $\mathfrak{g}_o \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{o}}$. Indeed, if $V = \xi_1 * \dots * \xi_\ell = \xi'_1 * \dots * \xi'_{\ell'}$, then by (4.18) the vector fields $A\xi_1 \bar{*} \dots \bar{*} A\xi_\ell$ and $A\xi'_1 \bar{*} \dots \bar{*} A\xi'_{\ell'}$ have the same action on the image of g , in particular they are the same at $\bar{o}$, hence they are the same everywhere.

By construction, this extension of A is a Lie algebra morphism and by Lemma 4.15 it is the P -differential of f at o . $\square$

We are now ready to prove Stepanov's Theorem:

Proof of Theorem A. It follows directly from the previous Rademacher type result by decomposing the set $L(f)$ into countable union E_i such that $f|_{E_i} : E_i \rightarrow \bar{M}$ is i -Lipschitz. Moreover the differential of $f|_{E_i}$ at a $\mathcal{V}$ -density point of E_i coincides with the differential of f , thanks to Lemma 4.10 and Lemma 4.15. $\square$

5. QUASIREGULAR MAPPINGS

5.1. Definition of a quasiregular mapping. Recall that a map $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be a *branched cover* if it is continuous, discrete and open. Recall also that a mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between topological spaces is *discrete* if each fiber is a discrete set in X , i.e. for all $y \in Y$, $f^{-1}(y)$ is a discrete set in X , and is *open* if it maps open set in X onto open set in Y . For a branched cover $f : M \rightarrow N$, the *linear dilatation* of f at $x \in M$ is defined to be

$$H_f(x) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} H_f(x, r) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)},$$

where

$$L_f(x, r) = \sup \{d(f(x), f(y)) : y \in \bar{B}(x, r)\}$$

and

$$l_f(x, r) = \inf \{d(f(x), f(y)) : y \in \partial B(x, r)\}.$$

We also set

$$H'_f(x) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} H'_f(x, r) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L'_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)},$$

where

$$L'_f(x, r) = \sup \{d(f(x), f(y)) : d(x, y) = r\}.$$

Definition 5.1 (Metric quasiregular mappings I). Let M and N be two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds. A branched cover $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be *metrically K -quasiregular* (of type 1) if it satisfies

- i). $H'_f(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in M$;
- ii). $H'_f(x) \leq K$ for almost every $x \in M$.

We say that $f : M \rightarrow N$ is *metrically quasiregular* (of type 1) if it is metrically K -quasiregular (of type 1) for some $1 \leq K < \infty$.

Definition 5.2 (Metric quasiregular mappings II). Let M and N be two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds. A branched cover $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be *metrically K -quasiregular* (of type 2) if it satisfies

- i). $H'_f(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in M$;
- ii). $H'_f(x) \leq K$ for almost every $x \in M$.

We say that $f : M \rightarrow N$ is *metrically quasiregular* (of type 2) if it is metrically K -quasiregular (of type 2) for some $1 \leq K < \infty$.

Remark 5.3. We would like to point out that for a continuous and open mapping, the condition $H'_f(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in M$ implies that f is discrete. Indeed, since f is open and non-constant, $L'_f(x, r) > 0$ for all $x \in M$ and $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r)$ is compact. On the other hand, if f is not discrete, then for some $y \in N$, $f^{-1}(y)$ would contain an accumulation point x , i.e. there is a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset f^{-1}(y)$ such that $x_i \rightarrow x$. By continuity of f , $f(x_i) \rightarrow f(x)$. Since $f(x_i) = y$ for all i , it is necessarily true that $y = f(x)$.

Consider the point x and denote by $r_i = d(x, x_i)$. Then $r_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Notice that $L'_f(x, r_i) > 0$ and that

$$l_f(x, r_i) = \inf \{d(f(x), f(y)) : y \in \partial B(x, r_i)\} = 0.$$

We thus obtain

$$H'_f(x) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L'_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)} = \infty,$$

contradicting the fact that $H'_f < \infty$ everywhere.

It is clear from the definition that f is metrically K -quasiregular of type 2 whenever it is metrically K -quasiregular of type 1. Indeed, the converse is also true and we will prove in Proposition 5.22 below that a branched cover $f : M \rightarrow N$ is metrically K -quasiregular of type 1 if and only if it is metrically K -quasiregular of type 2.

We next introduce the so-called weak (metrically) quasiregular mappings. For this, set $h_f(x) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} H_f(x, r)$.

Definition 5.4 (Weak metric quasiregular mappings). A branched cover $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be *weakly metrically K -quasiregular* if it is constant or if it satisfies

- i). $h_f(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in M$;

ii). $h_f(x) \leq K$ for almost every $x \in M$.

We say that $f : M \rightarrow N$ is *weakly metrically quasiregular* if it is weakly metrically K -regular for some $1 \leq K < \infty$.

We list some non-trivial examples of quasiregular mappings in the subRiemannian setting.

Example 5.5. i). (Example 6.23, [23]) Let $\mathbb{H}_1$ be the first Heisenberg group and let X, Y, T be the associated vector field. The mapping $f : \mathbb{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_1$ defined as $(r, \varphi, t) \mapsto (r/2, 2\varphi, t)$ in cylindrical coordinates is a quasiregular mapping with non-empty branch set. This mapping is a counterpart of the winding mapping in the Euclidean setting [55] and the branch set of f is the t -axis.

ii). (Theorem 3.5, [12]) The sphere $\mathbb{S}^{2n+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ admits a natural subRiemannian structure. Namely, one obtains the horizontal subbundle by taking a maximal complex subspace of $T\mathbb{S}^{2n+1} : H\mathbb{S}^{2n+1} = T\mathbb{S}^{2n+1} \cap iT\mathbb{S}^{2n+1}$. The Euclidean inner product on $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ then restricts to $H\mathbb{S}^{2n+1}$ as a subRiemannian metric tensor g and the corresponding norm $|\cdot|$.

For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, consider the multi-twist mapping of $\mathbb{S}^{2n+1}$ given by

$$F_a(re^{i\theta_1}, \dots, r_{n+1}e^{i\theta_{n+1}}) = (r_1e^{ia\theta_1}, \dots, r_{n+1}e^{ia\theta_{n+1}}).$$

Then $F_a : \mathbb{S}^{2n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{2n+1}$ is (metrically) $|a|$ -quasiregular.

iii). (Lemma 3.11, [12]) Let $p > 1$ be an integer and $q_1, \dots, q_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ relatively prime to p . Set $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_{n+1})$, and define

$$R_{p,\mathbf{q}}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n+1}) = (e^{2\pi i q_1/p}, e^{2\pi i q_2/p} z_2, \dots, e^{2\pi i q_{n+1}/p} z_{n+1}).$$

The associated lens space $L_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ is set to be the quotient space $\mathbb{S}^{2n+1}/\langle R_{p,\mathbf{q}} \rangle$. Moreover, $L_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ admits a natural subRiemannian structure; see for instance [12, Proposition 3.1].

For each $a \in p\mathbb{Z}$ for some positive integer p , the multi-twist mapping F_a from ii) induces a well-defined mapping on the lens space, namely

$$f_a : L_{p,\mathbf{q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{2n+1}, \quad f_a(|z|) := F_a(z) \text{ for } z \in \mathbb{S}^{2n+1}.$$

Then f_a is a quasiregular mapping. Moreover, if we denote by $\pi : \mathbb{S}^{2n+1} \rightarrow L_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ the usual projection, then the multi-twist mapping $\pi \circ f_a : L_{p,\mathbf{q}} \rightarrow L_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ of the lens spaces is quasiregular as well.

If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a continuous map, $y \in N$ and $A \subset M$, we use the notation

$$(5.1) \quad N(y, f, A) = \text{card}\{f^{-1}(y) \cap A\}$$

for the multiplicity function.

Definition 5.6 (Analytic quasiregular mappings). A branched cover $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be *analytically K -quasiregular* if $f \in N_{loc}^{1,Q}(M, N)$ and

$$g_f^Q(x) \leq K J_f(x)$$

for a.e. $x \in M$.

The “Jacobian” above is given by

$$(5.2) \quad J_f(x) = \frac{d(f^* \text{Vol}_N)(x)}{d \text{Vol}_M(x)},$$

where the pull-back $f^* \text{Vol}_N$ is defined as

$$(5.3) \quad f^* \text{Vol}_N(A) = \int_Y N(y, f, A) d \text{Vol}_N(y).$$

We pointed out an useful observation by the third named author [64] that the Jacobian $J_f(x)$ from (5.2) can be alternately described by

$$(5.4) \quad J_f(z) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_N(f(B(z, r)))}{\text{Vol}_M(B(z, r))}$$

for a.e. $z \in M$; see also [18, Section 4.3] for a simple proof of this fact.

Definition 5.7 (Geometric quasiregular mappings). A branch cover is said to be *geometrically K -quasiregular* if it satisfies the K_O -inequality, i.e. for each open set $\Omega \subset M$ and each path family Γ in $\Omega \subset M$, if ρ is a test function for $f(\Gamma)$, then

$$\text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma) \leq K \int_N N(y, f, \Omega) \rho^Q(y) d \text{Vol}_N(y).$$

The following result is a special case of the more general results obtained by the third named author [64].

Theorem 5.8. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a branched cover between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds of locally Q -bounded geometry. Then the following conditions are quantitatively equivalent:

- i). f is metrically K -quasiregular;
- ii). f is weakly metrically K -quasiregular;
- iii). f is analytically K' -quasiregular;
- iv). f is geometrically K' -quasiregular.

More precisely, the constants K and K' depend only on each other and on the data associated to M and N .

We believe that Theorem 5.8 remains valid even if M and N are not assumed to be of locally Q -bounded geometry. But we do not seek for this in the current paper and Theorem 5.8 will not be used in any of our following proofs.

5.2. Analytic properties of quasiregular mappings. Recall that for a continuous mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between two metric spaces, the *upper Lipschitz constant* $\text{Lip } f(x)$ of f at $x \in X$ is defined as

$$\text{Lip } f(x) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{y \in B(x, r)} \frac{d(f(x), f(y))}{r}.$$

Similarly, the *lower Lipschitz constant* $\text{lip } f(x)$ of f at $x \in X$ is defined as

$$\text{lip } f(x) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{y \in B(x, r)} \frac{d(f(x), f(y))}{r}.$$

The following simple lemma follows from the fact that an equiregular subRiemannian manifold N is locally LLC.

Lemma 5.9. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a continuous, discrete and open mapping. Then for each $x \in M$, there exist a constant $C \geq 1$ and a radius $r_x > 0$ such that for each $0 < r \leq r_x$,

$$B\left(f(x), \frac{l_f(x, r)}{C}\right) \subset f\left(B(x, r)\right) \subset B\left(f(x), CL'_f(x, r)\right).$$

Proof. We only prove the first inclusion since the proof of the second one is similar. Fix a point $x \in M$. Since M is locally compact, there exists $r_x > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r_x)$ is compact. Since N is equiregular, it is locally LLC and thus we may further assume that there exist a constant $C \geq 1$ and a radius $r_x > 0$ such that each two points $a, b \in B\left(f(x), \frac{l_f(x, r)}{C}\right)$ can be joined in $B(f(x), l_f(x, r))$ whenever $0 < r < r_x$. For $0 < r < r_x$, we claim that

$$B\left(f(x), \frac{l_f(x, r)}{C}\right) \subset f\left(B(x, r)\right).$$

For if not, there exists a point $b \in B\left(f(x), \frac{l_f(x, r)}{C}\right) \setminus f\left(B(x, r)\right)$. By the preceding assumption, we may find a path γ in $B(f(x), l_f(x, r))$ that joins $f(x)$ and b . Now $f(B(x, r))$ is open, $\gamma \cap f(B(x, r)) \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma \cap (N \setminus f(B(x, r))) = \emptyset$, and so it follows that $\gamma \cap \partial f(B(x, r)) \neq \emptyset$. Since f is open and $\overline{B}(x, r)$ is compact, $\partial f(B(x, r)) \subset f(\partial B(x, r))$, and so $\gamma \cap f(\partial B(x, r)) \neq \emptyset$. Choose $y \in \partial B(x, r)$ so that $f(y) \in \gamma \subset B(f(x), l_f(x, r))$. Then $d(f(x), f(y)) < l_f(x, r)$ and $d(x, y) = r$, which contradicts the definition of $l_f(x, r)$ and so our claim holds. $\square$

Remark 5.10. i). Note that a direct consequence of Lemma 5.9 is that if $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a metrically quasiregular mapping of type 2, then it is a locally metrically quasiregular mapping of type 1.

Indeed, by Lemma 5.9, for each $x \in M$, there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a radius $r_x > 0$ such that $f(B(x, r)) \subset B(f(x), CL'_f(x, r))$ for all $0 < r < r_x$. This implies that for $0 < r < r_x$, $L_f(x, r) \leq CL'_f(x, r)$ and so

$$H_f(x) \leq CH'_f(x).$$

ii). Since an equiregular subRiemannian manifold is locally geodesic and so in particular, it is 1-LLC-1 and thus the first inclusion in Lemma 5.9 holds with $C = 1$.

We next establish the Sobolev regularity of a quasiregular mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$, which was conjectured to be true in [12, The last paragraph before Section 2.1, Page 5].

Lemma 5.11. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping. Then $f \in N_{loc}^{1, Q}(M, N)$ and satisfies Condition N .

Proof. Note first that by [18, Lemma 3.3], a continuous open mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$ is locally pseudomonotone and that by [28, Theorem 7.2], a locally pseudomonotone map in $N_{loc}^{1, Q}(M, N)$ satisfies Condition N . Thus, it suffices to establish the Sobolev regularity.

By [63, Proof of Theorem 1.1], f satisfies Condition N on Q -almost every rectifiable curve. Note that in [63, Proof of Theorem 1.1], f is assumed to be a homomorphism.

However, the proof there directly works for discrete and open mappings since the homeomorphism assumption was only used to deduce the local L^1 -integrability of the Jacobian.

On such a curve, either $\int_\gamma \text{lip } f ds = \infty$, which means that $\text{lip } f$ is an upper gradient of f along γ , or we may apply [65, Lemma 3.6] to deduce that $\text{lip } f$ is an upper gradient of f along γ . This means that $\text{lip } f$ is a Q -weak upper gradient of f . To establish the desired Sobolev regularity for f , we only need to show that $\text{lip } f \in L^Q_{loc}(M)$.

By Remark 5.10 ii), for each $B(x, r) \subset\subset M$, $B(x, l_f(x, r)) \subset f(B(x, r))$ and so it follows from Lemma 5.9 that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{lip } f)^Q(x) &\leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L_f(x, r)^Q}{r^Q} \leq c \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_N(B(f(x), l_f(x)))}{\text{Vol}_M(B(x, r))} \\ &\leq c \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_N(f(B(x, r)))}{\text{Vol}_M(B(x, r))}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant c depends on x , Q and K but it is bounded on compact subset of M (due to the Ball-Box Theorem). On the other hand, for a.e. $x \in M$,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_N(f(B(x, r)))}{\text{Vol}_M(B(x, r))} = J_f(x),$$

from which we conclude that $\text{lip } f \in L^Q_{loc}(M)$. This completes our proof. $\square$

As a corollary of the well-known area formula for Lipschitz mappings [39, Theorem 1] and Lemma 5.11, we thus obtain the area formula for quasiregular mapping between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds.

Proposition 5.12. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping. Then the area formula

$$(5.5) \quad \int_A u \circ f(x) J_f(x) d\text{Vol}_M(x) = \int_N u(y) N(y, f, A) d\text{Vol}_N(y)$$

holds for each nonnegative measurable function u on N and every measurable set $A \subset M$.

Proposition 5.13. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping. Then $J_f(x) > 0$ for a.e. x in Ω and f satisfies Condition N^{-1} .

Proof. Note that by the proof of Lemma 5.11, for any $x \in M$, there exists a neighborhood U_x of x such that

$$\text{lip } f(x)^Q \leq C J_f(x)$$

a.e. in U_x , where C allows to depend on x as well. On the other hand, since by the proof of Lemma 5.11 $\text{lip } f$ is an upper gradient of f , the preceding inequality implies that f is locally analytically C -quasiregular according to the definition of [18]. Since the issue is local, we may assume that U_x and $f(U_x)$ each supports a $(1, 1)$ -Poincaré inequality. The result now follows from [18, Proposition 4.18]. $\square$

Remark 5.14. It was asked in [12, Question 2.19] *whether condition i) in Definition 5.1 is equivalent to the assumption that H_f is locally bounded in M* . This is indeed the case, since locally, equiregular subRiemannian manifolds have bounded geometry. The

proof of Theorem 7.1 from [49] can be adapted to our setting by first noticing that, locally, metric quasiregular mappings are analytically quasiregular (as seen in the proof of Proposition 5.13) and hence Theorem 6.2 from [49] holds in this setting. Moreover, by [18, Lemma 3.3], the necessary topological Lemma 4.2 from [49] holds in our setting as well. With these facts at hand, the proof of Theorem 7.1 from [49] works directly in our situation; see also [64] for a proof of this fact in more general metric spaces.

We next prove that the Jacobian of a quasiregular mapping coincides with the Jacobian of the P -differential a.e. Recall that if f is P -differentiable at x_0 , then the Jacobian of the P -differential $Df(x_0)$ is defined as

$$(5.6) \quad J_{Df(x_0)}(0) = \frac{\text{Vol}(Df(x_0)(B(0, 1)))}{\text{Vol}(B(0, 1))}.$$

Let g be the subRiemannian metric tensor of M . Let δ_ε be the dilations associated to the privileged coordinates. Notice that $(\delta_\varepsilon)_*g$ is isometric via δ_ε to $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}g$ and $g_\varepsilon \rightarrow g_0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, which is a subRiemannian metric. Mitchell's theorem [45] can be restated as the fact that $(\mathbb{R}^n, g_0)$ is the tangent Carnot group $\mathbb{G}_p$. As pointed out in Section 4, the maps $\delta_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ f \circ \delta_\varepsilon$ converges uniformly, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, on compact sets to the map $Df(p)$. Moreover, by the functoriality of the construction of the Popp measure, we have that $\text{Vol}^{g_\varepsilon} \rightarrow \text{Vol}^{g_0}$, in the sense that if η_ε is the smooth function such that $\text{Vol}^{g_\varepsilon} = \eta_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}$, then $\eta_\varepsilon \rightarrow \eta_0$ uniformly on compact sets; see also [3] for these facts about Popp measures.

Proposition 5.15. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a mapping that is P -differentiable at $x_0 \in M$. Then

$$J_{Df(x_0)}(0) = J_f(x_0).$$

Proof. Denote by $B_r^{g_\varepsilon}$ the ball centered at 0 with radius r with respect to the metric g_ε . We have

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-Q} \text{Vol}^g(f(B_\varepsilon^g)) &= \text{Vol}^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}g}(f(B_1^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}g})) = \text{Vol}^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}g}(\delta_\varepsilon \circ \delta_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ f \circ \delta_\varepsilon \circ \delta_\varepsilon^{-1}(B_1^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}g})) \\ &= \text{Vol}^{g_\varepsilon}(\delta_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ f \circ \delta_\varepsilon \circ \delta_\varepsilon^{-1}(B_1^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}g})) \rightarrow \text{Vol}^{g_0}(Df(x_0)(B_1^{g_0})). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by [16, Lemma 1 (iii)], for all $q \in M$, we have the expansion

$$(5.8) \quad \text{Vol}_M(B(q, \varepsilon)) = \varepsilon^Q \text{Vol}(B(0, 1)) + o(\varepsilon^Q).$$

Using (5.7) and (5.8), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{Df(x_0)}(0) &= \frac{\text{Vol}(Df(x_0)(B(0, 1)))}{\text{Vol}(B(0, 1))} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_N(f(B(x_0, \varepsilon)))}{\varepsilon^Q \text{Vol}(B(0, 1))} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_N(f(B(x_0, \varepsilon)))}{\text{Vol}_M(B(x_0, \varepsilon))} = J_f(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

□

5.3. Differentiability of quasiregular mappings. In this section, we show that weak metric quasiregular mappings are P -differentiable a.e. in M .

Proposition 5.16. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be an open mapping between two equiregular sub-Riemannian manifolds of homogeneous dimension $Q \geq 2$. If $f \in N_{loc}^{1,Q}(M, N)$, then f is P -differentiable a.e. in M .

Proof. This is a simple consequence of Theorem A and [28, Theorem 7.2]. Indeed, the openness of f implies that f is locally *pseudomonotone* (see for instance [18, Lemma 3.3]). A locally pseudomonotone mapping in $N_{loc}^{1,Q}(M, N)$ satisfies the so-called *Rado-Reichelderfer condition*, namely, for each $x \in M$, there exists a radius $r_x > 0$ such that

$$\text{diam } f(B(x, r_x))^Q \leq C \int_{B(x, r_x)} g_f(x)^Q d\text{Vol}_M(x).$$

As a consequence of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, we obtain that $\text{Lip } f(x) < \infty$ for a.e. $x \in M$ and thus the claim follows from Theorem A. $\square$

Theorem 5.17. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping. Then f is P -differentiable a.e. in M . Moreover, for a.e. $x_0 \in M$, the P -differential $Df(x_0)$ is a Carnot group isomorphism that commutes with group dilations.

Proof. The a.e. differentiability follows immediately from Lemma 5.11 and Proposition 5.16. Regarding the second claim, notice that by Proposition 5.13, the Jacobian of f is positive a.e. in M . On the other hand, by Proposition 5.15, for a.e. $x_0 \in M$, the Jacobian $J_f(x_0)$ coincides with the determinant of the P -differential $Df(x_0)$ and so $Df(x_0)$ is a group isomorphism. $\square$

5.4. The minimal upper gradient and Jacobian. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a mapping. If f is P -differentiable at $x_0 \in M$, then the maximal norm of the differential $Df(x_0)$ is defined as

$$(5.9) \quad \|Df(x_0)\| := \max \left\{ \hat{d}(0, Df(x_0)(v)) : \hat{d}(0, v) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Similarly, the minimal norm of the differential $Df(x_0)$ is defined as

$$(5.10) \quad \|Df(x_0)\|_s := \min \left\{ \hat{d}(0, Df(x_0)(v)) : \hat{d}(0, v) \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Df(x_0)\| &= \max \left\{ |Df(x_0)v| : v \in V_1 \text{ and } |v| = 1 \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L_f(x_0, r)}{r} \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Df(x_0)\|_s &= \min \left\{ |Df(x_0)v| : v \in V_1 \text{ and } |v| = 1 \right\} \\ &= \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{l_f(x_0, r)}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.18. If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a weak metrically K -quasiregular mapping, then

$$(5.11) \quad \frac{\|Df(x_0)\|}{\|Df(x_0)\|_s} \leq K$$

for a.e. $x_0 \in M$.

Proof. This follows from [12, Proofs of Lemma 5.15 and Theorem 5.16]. The only difference one has to notice is that the definition of a K -quasiregular mapping in [12] is stronger than the one used in this paper, namely the branch set and its image are assumed to have zero measure. However, the proofs of Lemma 5.15 and Theorem 5.16 there only use the fact that at a.e. $x_0 \in M$, f is P -differentiable and the P -differential $Df(x_0)$ is a Carnot group isomorphism, which is provided by Theorem 5.17. $\square$

It is a well-known fact that if $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is differentiable at x_0 , then

$$\text{lip } f(x_0) = \text{Lip } f(x_0) = \|Df(x_0)\|.$$

The next lemma can be viewed as a natural generalization of this fact to the subRiemannian setting.

Lemma 5.19. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a mapping which is P -differentiable at $x_0 \in M$. Then

$$(5.12) \quad \text{lip } f(x_0) = \text{Lip } f(x_0) = \|Df(x_0)\|.$$

Proof. Since the issue is local, we may assume that M, N are open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $x_0 = 0 = f(x_0)$. The P -differentiability of f at 0 implies that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(f(y), Df(0)y)}{d(0, y)} = 0.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{d(f(y), f(0))}{r} &\leq \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{d(Df(0)y, f(0))}{r} + \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{d(f(y), Df(0)y)}{r} \\ &= \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \left(\frac{d(Df(0)y, f(0))}{d^0(Df(0)y, 0)} \cdot d^0(Df(0)y, 0) \right) + \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{o(d(0, y))}{r} \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in B^0(0, (1+O(r))r)} (1 + O(r)) d^0(Df(0)y, 0) + \frac{o(r)}{r} \\ &= \sup_{y \in B^0(0, (1+O(r))r)} (1 + O(r)) \frac{\|Df(0)\| d^0(0, y)}{r} + \frac{o(r)}{r}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that $\text{Lip } f(0) \leq \|Df(0)\|$.

On the other hand, let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and a similar computation as above implies that

$$\sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{d(f(y), f(0))}{r} \geq \sup_{y \in B^0(0, (1-O(r))r)} (1 - O(r)) \frac{\bar{d}(Df(0)y, 0)}{r} - \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{d(f(y), Df(0)y)}{r}.$$

We may choose $y_0 \in \partial B(0, (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - O(r))r)$ realizing $\|Df(0)\|$ to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in B^0(0, (1 - O(r))r)} \frac{d(f(y), f(0))}{r} &\geq (1 - O(r)) \frac{\|Df(0)\| d(y_0, 0)}{r} - \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{d(f(y), Df(0)y)}{r} \\ &= (1 - O(r))^2 (1 - \varepsilon) \|Df(0)\| - \sup_{y \in B(0, r)} \frac{o(d(0, y))}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to $(1 - \varepsilon) \|Df(0)\| \leq \text{lip } f(0)$. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives

$$\text{Lip } f(0) \leq \|Df(0)\| \leq \text{lip } f(0) \leq \text{Lip } f(0).$$

□

We are ready to show that $\text{Lip } f$ is the minimal Q -weak upper gradient of a quasiregular mapping f .

Proposition 5.20. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping. Then $\text{Lip } f$ is the minimal Q -weak upper gradient of f , i.e.

$$(5.13) \quad g_f = \text{Lip } f.$$

Proof. Since the issue is local, we may assume that M and N are open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We will follow the arguments used in [62, Proof of Theorem 5.2].

Note that $\text{Lip } f$ is always a Q -weak upper gradient of f and we need to show the minimality, namely if g is any other Q -weak upper gradient of f , then $g(x) \geq \text{Lip } f(x)$ for a.e. $x \in M$.

To this end, let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of C^1 -functions $F : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\nabla_H F| = 1$ on N and $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset \mathcal{D}$ a countable dense subset in the sense that for each $y \in N$, $\{\nabla_H F(y) : F \in \mathcal{D}_0\}$ is dense in the horizontal unit sphere $\{v \in V_1 : |v| = 1\}$. Notice that if g is a Q -weak upper gradient of f , then for each $F \in \mathcal{D}_0$ it is also a Q -weak upper gradient of $F \circ f$.

Since $F \circ f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real-valued function, by the result of Cheeger [10], $\text{Lip}(F \circ f)$ is the minimal Q -weak upper gradient of $F \circ f$. From this, we infer that

$$g \geq \sup_{F \in \mathcal{D}_0} \text{Lip}(F \circ f)$$

a.e. in M . On the other hand, by [20, Section 11.2]

$$\text{Lip}(F \circ f)(x) = |\nabla_H(F \circ f)(x)| = |Df(x)^* \nabla_H F(f(x))|$$

for a.e. $x \in M$, where $Df(p)^* : T_{f(p)}N \rightarrow T_pM$ is the formal adjoint of $Df(p)$. Note that if x is a differentiable point of f , then the set $\{\nabla_H F(f(x)) : F \in \mathcal{D}_0\}$ is dense in the horizontal unit sphere $\{v \in V_1 : |v| = 1\}$, and so at such a point $x \in M$,

$$\sup_{F \in \mathcal{D}_0} \text{Lip}(F \circ f)(x) = \sup_{F \in \mathcal{D}_0} |Df(x)^* \nabla_H F(f(x))| = \|Df(x)^*\| = \|Df(x)\|,$$

where in the last equality we have used the standard fact that for a linear map $L : V \rightarrow W$ between two Hilbert spaces V and W , $\|L\| = \|L^*\|$. Therefore, it follows from the above

estimate and Lemma 5.19 that

$$g \geq \sup_{F \in \mathcal{D}_0} \text{Lip}(F \circ f) = \|Df\| = \text{Lip } f$$

a.e. in M . This completes the proof of Proposition 5.20. $\square$

Remark 5.21. It is already well-known that for a quasiregular mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$ between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds of homogenous dimension $Q \geq 2$, $\text{Lip } f$ is always locally comparable with the minimal Q -upper gradient of f (with a constant depending on the locality) (cf. [62, Section 5]). However, the exact coincidence of these two functions is a highly non-trivial fact and indeed plays an important role in the identification of the different notions of 1-quasiconformality (or conformality) in the under-going work [9].

5.5. Equivalence of the two definitions of metric quasiregularity.

Proposition 5.22. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a branched cover. Then f is metrically K -quasiregular of type 1 if and only if it is metrically K -quasiregular of type 2.

Proof. Note first that by Remark 5.10, for each $x \in M$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, $H'_f(x) \leq H_f(x) \leq CH'_f(x)$. In particular, if $H'_f(x) < \infty$, then $H_f(x) < \infty$. We are thus left to show that $H'_f(x) \leq H_f(x)$ a.e. in M .

By Theorem 5.17 and Proposition 5.13, f is P -differentiable a.e. and $J_f(x) > 0$ for a.e. such x in M . Let x be a differentiable point of f with $J_f(x) > 0$. Since the issue is local, we may assume that M and N are open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $x = 0 = f(x)$. By the P -differentiability of f at 0, for $r = d(0, y)$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} L_f(0, r) &= \sup \{d(f(0), f(y)) : d(0, y) \leq r\} \\ &= \sup \{d(f(0), Df(0)y) + (d(f(0), f(y)) - d(f(0), Df(0)y)) : d(0, y) \leq r\} \\ &\leq \sup \{d(f(0), Df(0)y) : d(0, y) \leq r\} + o(r) \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \frac{d(f(0), Df(0)y)}{d^0(0, Df(0)y)} d^0(0, Df(0)y) : d^0(0, y) \leq (1 + O(r))r \right\} + o(r) \\ &\leq (1 + O(r)) \sup \{d^0(0, Df(0)y) : d^0(0, y) = (1 + O(r))r\} + o(r) \\ &\leq (1 + O(r))^2 L'_f(0, r) + 2o(r). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} l_f(0, r) &= \inf \{d(f(0), f(y)) : d(0, y) = r\} \\ &\geq (1 - O(r)) \inf \{d^0(0, Df(0)y) : d(0, y) = (1 - O(r))r\} - 2o(r) \\ &\geq (1 - O(r))^2 \|Df(0)\|_s r - 2o(r). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of the above estimates,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_f(x) &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} H_f(x, r) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)} \\
&\leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{(1 + O(r))^2 L'_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)} + \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{o(r)}{l_f(x, r)} \\
&\leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} (1 + O(r))^2 H'_f(x, r) + \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{o(r)}{(1 - O(r))^2 \|Df(x)\|_s r - o(r)} \\
&= H'_f(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows the coincidence of these two definitions as desired. $\square$

Remark 5.23. In principle, one could also define two types of weak metric quasiregular mappings as the metric quasiregular case. As an immediate consequence of the proof of Proposition 5.22, we conclude that the two types of definitions of weak quasiregularity will be equivalent.

5.6. Size of the branch set. In this section, we prove that the branch set of a quasiregular mapping has measure zero, which was expected to be true in [12, Remark 1.2]. This fact was indeed a corollary of the more general results obtained recently in [19]. We prefer presenting the alternative approach here since it is more elementary and the basic idea behind the proof is similar to the one used in the Euclidean case.

Recall that for each $p \in M$ and r small enough (depending on p), the exponential mapping $\exp_p : U \rightarrow B(p, r)$ is a homeomorphism and satisfies

$$(5.14) \quad L^{-1}d(p, q) \leq d^p(\exp_p^{-1}(p), \exp_p^{-1}(q)) \leq Ld(p, q)$$

for all $q \in B(p, r)$. Here, L is a constant depending on the local information around p .

Theorem 5.24. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a weak metric quasiregular mapping. Then

$$\text{Vol}_M(\mathcal{B}_f) = \text{Vol}_N(f(\mathcal{B}_f)) = 0.$$

Proof. Since f satisfies Condition N , we only need to prove that $\mathcal{B}_f$ has measure zero. We will prove that if $p \in M$ is a point such that f is P -differentiable at p and $J_f(p) > 0$, then $p \notin \mathcal{B}_f$.

Before turning to the detailed proof, let us briefly indicate the idea: for a point $p \in M$ as above, the P -differential $Df(p)$ of f at p is a group isomorphism of the corresponding tangent Carnot groups and we may approximate f in a neighborhood of p by the P -differential composed with the exponential mapping. Locally, the exponential mapping is a homeomorphism that satisfies (5.14). This implies that f is close to a homeomorphism in a neighborhood of p and so we may use the standard homotopy argument to show that the local index of f at p is ± 1 . This means $p \notin \mathcal{B}_f$. Since all such points have full measure in M , $\mathcal{B}_f$ must have measure zero. See [30] for the definition of local index of a continuous mapping between manifolds and its homotopy invariance.

Fix such a point p . Choosing r sufficiently small if necessary, we may assume that the mappings $\exp_p^{-1}|_{B(p,r)} : U \rightarrow B(p,r)$ and $\exp_{f(p)}^{-1}|_{f(B(p,r))} : V \rightarrow f(B(p,r))$ are homeomorphisms that satisfy (5.14) with some constant $L = L(p)$. Since f is P -differentiable at p and $J_f(p) > 0$, the P -differential $Df(p) : (\mathbb{G}_p, d^p) \rightarrow (\mathbb{G}_{f(p)}, d^{f(p)})$ is a group isomorphism. We define a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \times \overline{B}(p, r) \rightarrow (\mathbb{G}_{f(p)}, d^{f(p)})$ between $Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(x)$ and $\exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(x)$ by

$$H_t(x) = Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(x) \cdot (\delta_t Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(x))^{-1} \cdot (\delta_t \exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(x)).$$

It is clear $H_0(x) = Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(x)$ is a homeomorphism and thus we only need to verify that H_t is a proper homotopy between H_0 and H_1 , i.e. $\exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(p) \notin H_t(\partial B(p, r))$.

Note that the minimal norm of $Df(p)$ defined as in (5.10)

$$\lambda = \|Df(p)\|_s > 0,$$

since $J_f(p) > 0$. By Triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & d^{f(p)}(H_0(x) \cdot (\delta_t H_0(x))^{-1} \cdot \delta_t H_1(x), \exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(p)) \\ & \geq d^{f(p)}(H_0(x), \exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(p)) - d^{f(p)}(H_0(x) \cdot (\delta_t H_0(x))^{-1} \cdot \delta_t H_1(x), H_0(x)) \\ & =: I_1 - I_2. \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate I_1 from above:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= d^{f(p)}(H_0(x), \exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(p)) = d^{f(p)}(H_0(x), Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(p)) \\ &= d^{f(p)}(Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(x), Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(p)) \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda}{2} d^p(\exp_p^{-1}(x), \exp_p^{-1}(p)) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2L} d(x, p). \end{aligned}$$

We next estimate I_2 from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= d^{f(p)}(H_0(x) \cdot (\delta_t H_0(x))^{-1} \cdot \delta_t H_1(x), H_0(x)) \\ &= d^{f(p)}((\delta_t H_0(x))^{-1} \cdot \delta_t H_1(x), 0) \\ &= d^{f(p)}(\delta_t H_1(x), \delta_t H_0(x)) \\ &= t d^{f(p)}(H_1(x), H_0(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the P -differentiability of f at p implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d^{f(p)}(H_1(x), H_0(x)) &= d^{f(p)}(\exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(x), Df(p) \circ \exp_p^{-1}(x)) \\ &= o(d(x, p)) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow p. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\exp_{f(p)}^{-1} \circ f(p) \notin H_t(\partial B(p, r))$ for all sufficiently small r and all $t \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, $i(p, f) = i(p, H_1) = i(p, H_0) = \pm 1$ and $p \notin \mathcal{B}_f$. $\square$

6. OPEN QUESTIONS

Since the basic theory of quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds was established, in this section, we list some natural open questions for further research.

In the smooth setting, there is another well-known approach to establish the theory of quasiregular mappings based on the non-linear potential theory, see for instance [25]. This approach was used by Heinonen and Holopainen [23] in the study of quasiregular mappings between Carnot groups. It is natural to ask the following question.

Question 6.1. Is it possible to establish the theory of quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds via the non-linear potential theory?

Note that the study of (sub-)Q-harmonic equation is necessary in order to handle Question 6.1, which might be of independent interest.

A deep theorem of Reshetnyak [54] says that non-constant analytic quasiregular mappings between Euclidean spaces are indeed both discrete and open. This result was further generalized by Heinonen and Holopainen [23] to the setting of certain Carnot groups, namely, non-constant analytic quasiregular mappings between Carnot groups of Heisenberg type are both discrete and open. It is natural to inquire whether this is a general fact for quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds.

Question 6.2. Is it true that a non-constant analytic quasiregular mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$ between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds is both discrete and open?

A first attempt to Question 6.2 would be the study the case when M and N are Carnot groups.

Another interesting result from [23] says that quasiregular mappings between certain Carnot groups are in fact conformal. Thus, we could ask the following question.

Question 6.3. For which subRiemannian manifolds M and N does there exist a non-trivial quasiregular mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$?

The well-known global homeomorphism theorem of Gromov and Zorich states that a locally homeomorphic quasiregular mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$ from a n -dimensional Riemannian manifold M into a simply connected n -dimensional Riemannian manifold N is a homeomorphism onto its image, provided $n \geq 3$. Moreover, the exceptional set $N \setminus f(M)$ has zero n -capacity; see for instance [32, 17].

Question 6.4. Does the global homeomorphism theorem hold for locally homeomorphic quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds?

A classical result of Martio, Rickman and Väisälä [44] states that there exists a constant $\varepsilon(n) > 0$ such that every non-constant K -quasiregular mapping in dimension $n \geq 3$ is locally homeomorphic when $n \geq 3$; see also [51] for a quantitative estimate of $\varepsilon(n)$.

Question 6.5. Is there an $\varepsilon > 0$, depending only on the data of the equiregular subRiemannian manifolds, such that every $(1+\varepsilon)$ -quasiregular mapping between two equiregular subRiemannian manifolds of homogeneous dimension $Q \geq 3$ is locally homeomorphic?

Question 6.6. Does the Picard type results from [55] and [6] and Bloch's Theorem from [52] hold for quasiregular mappings between equiregular subRiemannian manifolds?

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Academy Professor Pekka Koskela and Professor Enrico Le Donne for helpful discussions on related topics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z.Balogh, K.Fässler and K.Peltonen, Uniformly quasiregular maps on the compactified Heisenberg group, *J. Geom. Anal.* 22 (2012), no. 3, 633-665.
- [2] Z.Balogh, P.Koskela and S.Rogovin, Absolute continuity of quasiconformal mappings on curves, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 17 (2007), no. 3, 645-664.
- [3] D.Barilari and L.Rizzi, A formula for Popp's volume in sub-Riemannian geometry, *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces* 1 (2013), 42-57.
- [4] A.Bellaïche, The tangent space in sub-Riemannian geometry, *Sub-Riemannian geometry*, 1-78, *Progr. Math.*, 144, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996.
- [5] B.Bojarski and T.Iwaniec, Analytical foundations of the theory of quasiconformal mappings in $\mathbb{R}^n$, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* 8 (1983), no. 2, 257-324.
- [6] M.Bonk and J.Heinonen, Quasiregular mappings and cohomology, *Acta Math.* 186 (2001), no. 2, 219-238.
- [7] M.Bonk and B.Kleiner, Quasisymmetric parametrizations of two-dimensional metric spheres, *Invent. Math.* 150 (2002), no. 1, 127-183.
- [8] M.Bonk and B.Kleiner, Conformal dimension and Gromov hyperbolic groups with 2-sphere boundary. *Geom. Topol.* 9 (2005), 219-246 (electronic).
- [9] L.Capogna, E.Le Donne and A.Ottazzi, Conformality and Q -harmonicity in subRiemannian manifolds, in preparation 2015.
- [10] J.Cheeger, Differentiability of Lipschitz functions on metric measure spaces, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 9 (1999), no. 3, 428-517.
- [11] W.Choi and R.Ronge, Privileged coordinates and tangent groupoid for Carnot manifolds, preprint 2015.
- [12] K.Fässler, A.Lukyanenko and K.Peltonen, Quasiregular mappings on subRiemannian manifolds, *J. Geom. Anal.* (to appear), DOI 10.1007/s12220-015-9607-5.
- [13] H.Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. 153, Springer, New York, 1969.
- [14] F.W.Gehring, Rings and quasiconformal mappings in space, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 103 (1962), 353-393.
- [15] F.W.Gehring, Quasiconformal mappings in space, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 69 (1963), 146-164.
- [16] R.Ghezzi and F.Jean, Hausdorff measure and dimensions in non equiregular sub-Riemannian manifolds, *Geometric control theory and sub-Riemannian geometry*, 201-218, Springer INdAM Ser., 5, Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [17] C.Y.Guo, Mappings of finite inner distortion: global homeomorphism theorem, *J. Geom. Anal.* 25 (2015), no. 3, 1969-1991.
- [18] C.Y.Guo, Mappings of finite distortion between metric measure spaces, *Conform. Geom. Dyn.* 19 (2015), 95-121.
- [19] C.Y.Guo and M.Williams, Porosity of the branch set of discrete open mappings with controlled linear dilatation, preprint 2015.
- [20] P.Hajlasz and P.Koskela, Sobolev met Poincaré, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 145 (2000), no. 688.
- [21] J.Heinonen, *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [22] J.Heinonen, Nonsmooth calculus. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 44 (2007), no. 2, 163-232.
- [23] J.Heinonen and I.Holopainen, Quasiregular maps on Carnot groups, *J. Geom. Anal.* 7 (1997), no. 1, 109-148.
- [24] J.Heinonen and S.Keith, Flat forms, bi-Lipschitz parameterizations, and smoothability of manifolds, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* No. 113 (2011), 1-37.

- [25] J.Heinonen, T.Kilpeläinen and O.Martio, Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations, Unabridged republication of the 1993 original. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2006. xii+404 pp.
- [26] J.Heinonen and P.Koskela, Definitions of quasiconformality, *Invent. Math.* 120 (1995), 61-79.
- [27] J.Heinonen and P.Koskela, Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry, *Acta Math.* 181 (1998), 1-61.
- [28] J.Heinonen, P.Koskela, N.Shanmugalingam and J.T.Tyson, Sobolev classes of Banach space-valued functions and quasiconformal mappings, *J. Anal. Math.* 85 (2001), 87-139.
- [29] J.Heinonen, P.Koskela, N.Shanmugalingam and J.T.Tyson, Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces: an approach based on upper gradients, *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics Series* 2015 (To appear).
- [30] J.Heinonen and S.Rickman, Geometric branched covers between generalized manifolds, *Duke Math. J.* 113 (2002), no. 3, 465-529.
- [31] J.Heinonen and D.Sullivan, On the locally branched Euclidean metric gauge, *Duke Math. J.* 114 (2002), no. 1, 15-41.
- [32] I.Holopainen and P.Pankka, Mappings of finite distortion: global homeomorphism theorem, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 29 (2004), no. 1, 59-80.
- [33] T.Iwaniec and G.Martin, Geometric function theory and non-linear analysis, *Oxford Mathematical Monographs*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2001.
- [34] D.Jerison, The Poincaré inequality for vector fields satisfying Hörmander's condition, *Duke Math J.* 53 (1986), 503-523.
- [35] S.Keith, Modulus and the Poincaré inequality on metric measure spaces, *Math. Z.* 245 (2003), no. 2, 255-292.
- [36] A.Korányi and H.M.Reimann, Quasiconformal mappings on the Heisenberg group, *Invent. Math.* 80 (1985), no. 2, 309-338.
- [37] A.Korányi and H.M.Reimann, Foundations for the theory of quasiconformal mappings on the Heisenberg group, *Adv. Math.* 111 (1995), no. 1, 1-87.
- [38] P.Koskela and P.MacManus, Quasiconformal mappings and Sobolev spaces, *Studia Math.* 131 (1998), no. 1, 1-17.
- [39] V.Magnani, An area formula in metric spaces, *Colloq. Math.* 124 (2011), no. 2, 275-283.
- [40] G.A.Margulis and G.D.Mostow, The differential of a quasi-conformal mapping of a Carnot-Carathéodory space, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 5 (1995), no. 2, 402-433.
- [41] G.A.Margulis and G.D.Mostow, Some remarks on the definition of tangent cones in a Carnot-Carathéodory space, *J. Anal. Math.* 80 (2000), 299-317.
- [42] O.Martio, S.Rickman and J.Väisälä, Definitions for quasiregular mappings, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I* No. 448 (1969), 40 pp.
- [43] O.Martio, S.Rickman and J.Väisälä, Distortion and singularities of quasiregular mappings, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I* No. 465 (1970), 13 pp.
- [44] O.Martio, S.Rickman and J.Väisälä, Topological and metric properties of quasiregular mappings, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I* No. 488 (1971), 31 pp.
- [45] J.Mitchell, On Carnot-Carathéodory metrics, *J. Differential Geom.* 21 (1985), no. 1, 35-45.
- [46] R.Montgomery, A tour of subriemannian geometries, their geodesics and applications, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 91. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [47] G.D.Mostow, Strong rigidity of locally symmetric spaces, *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, No. 78. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1973. v+195 pp.
- [48] A.Nagel, E.M.Stein and S.Wainger, Balls and metrics defined by vector fields I: basic properties, *Acta Math.* 155 (1985), 103-147.
- [49] J.Onninen and K.Rajala, Quasiregular mappings to generalized manifolds, *J. Anal. Math.* 109 (2009), 33-79.

- [50] P.Pansu, Métriques de Carnot-Carathéodory et quasiisométries des espaces symétriques de rang un, (French) [Carnot-Carathéodory metrics and quasi-isometries of rank-one symmetric spaces] Ann. of Math. (2) 129 (1989), no. 1, 1-60.
- [51] K.Rajala, The local homeomorphism property of spatial quasiregular mappings with distortion close to one. Geom. Funct. Anal. 15 (2005), no. 5, 1100-1127.
- [52] K.Rajala, Bloch's theorem for mappings of bounded and finite distortion, Math. Ann. 339 (2007), no. 2, 445-460.
- [53] K.Rajala, Uniformization of two-dimensional metric surfaces, preprint 2014.
- [54] Yu.G.Reshetnyak, Space mappings with bounded distortion, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 73. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1989.
- [55] S.Rickman, Quasiregular Mappings, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (3) 26, Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [56] W.Rudin, Real and complex analysis, Third edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.
- [57] N.Shanmugalingam, Newtonian spaces: an extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 16 (2000), no. 2, 243-279.
- [58] J.Tyson, Quasiconformality and quasisymmetry in metric measure spaces, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 23 (1998), no. 2, 525-548.
- [59] J.Tyson, Metric and geometric quasiconformality in Ahlfors regular Loewner spaces. Conform. Geom. Dyn. 5 (2001), 21-73 (electronic).
- [60] J.Väisälä, Lectures on n -dimensional quasiconformal mappings, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 229. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1971.
- [61] S.K.Vodopyanov, Foundations of the theory of mappings with bounded distortion on Carnot groups. The interaction of analysis and geometry, 303-344, Contemp. Math., 424, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [62] M.Williams, Geometric and analytic quasiconformality in metric measure spaces, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140 (2012), no. 4, 1251-1266.
- [63] M.Williams, Dilatation, pointwise Lipschitz constants, and Condition N on curves, Michigan Math. J. 63 (2014), no. 4, 687-700.
- [64] M.Williams, Definition of quasiregularity in metric measure spaces, preprint 2015.
- [65] T.Zürcher, Local Lipschitz numbers and Sobolev spaces, Michigan Math. J. 55 (2007), no. 3, 561-574.

(Chang-Yu Guo) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ,
P.O. BOX 35, FI-40014, JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND

E-mail address: changyu.c.guo@jyu.fi

(Sebastiano Nicolussi Golo) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF
JYVÄSKYLÄ, P.O. BOX 35, FI-40014, JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND

E-mail address: sebastiano.nicolussi-golo@jyu.fi

(Marshall Williams) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN,
KANSAS 66506, USA

E-mail address: mcwill@ksu.edu